

S. Clarke

No. 63.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
GENERAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—NO. XXXIII.

JULY, 1834.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
I. LIFE OF WILLIAM ROSCOE . . .	273	IV. LIFE OF SCHILLER . . .	365
1. The Life of WILLIAM ROSCOE, by his Son HENRY ROSCOE.		The Life of FRIEDRICH SCHIL- LER, comprehending an Exam- ination of his Works. From the London edition.	
2. American Edition of the same Work.		V. PROFESSOR PALFREY'S SER- MONS . . .	392
II. SPIRIT OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES . . .	305	Sermons on Duties belonging to Some of the Conditions and Rela- tions of Private Life. By JOHN G. PALFREY, A. M., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Univer- sity of Cambridge.	
Spirit of the Hebrew Scriptures. —No. II. Temptation, Sin, and Punishment.		NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE . .	401
III. HENGSTENBERG'S CHRISTOL- OGY . . .	321	The Salem Controversy. — Mas- sachusetts School Fund. — Good- win's Discourses. — The Gospel Palladium. — The Biblical Cabi- net. — New Edition of the En- glish Bible. — Torrey's Transla- tion of Neander's History of the Christian Church.	
Christologie des Alten Testaments, und Commentar über die Messian- ischen Weissagungen der Prophe- ten. Von E. W. HENGSTEN- BERG, &c.		INDEX . . .	405
Christology of the Old Testa- ment, and Commentary upon the Prophecies relating to the Mes- siah. By Dr. E. W. HENGSTEN- BERG, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin.			

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY CHARLES BOWEN.

LONDON:

ROWLAND HUNTER, AND R. J. KENNETT, GREAT QUEEN STREET.

1834.

NOTICE.

The *Christian Examiner* is published once in two months, on the first day of March, May, July, September, November, and January, making six numbers, of 136 pages each, or two volumes, of 408 pages each, for every year, at \$4 per annum, payable on the delivery of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May.

All communications may be directed "To the Editors of the *Christian Examiner*, care of Charles Bowen."

CHARLES BOWEN,

NO. 141 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON,

HAS JUST PUBLISHED

DISCOURSES ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING, D. D. 12mo.

(This volume is composed entirely of discourses never before published.)

"The fervid and eloquent pen of the Rev. Mr. Channing, whether employed, as in the volume before us, in elucidating the truth and the beauty of the Christian Revelation and the obligations and duties of man under it, — or in critically analysing the character, the deeds, and the influence of the mighty Napoleon, — or in examining in prose scarcely less inspired than the glowing strains of the Poet himself, the works and genius of Milton, — can never appeal in vain to educated readers. In truth, we consider Mr. Channing as one of the greatest living masters of the English language; and when to the beauty of style is added the logical force of a well disciplined and highly cultivated mind, — of which, as in the work now under notice, the whole energies are devoted to prove to the understanding, and to make perceptible to the heart the reasonableness, as well as the indispensableness to happiness both here and hereafter, of faith in the Christian dispensation, — it will be readily believed that he has made a book that will be widely read. We speak not here in reference to the peculiar views of the writer as to the nature of the Saviour, — these, doubtless, though only appearing incidentally, may have the effect of diverting many from his pages; — yet we know not where, in the same space, can be found a more striking and irresistible statement of the evidences of Christianity, than in the first discourse of this volume." — *New York American*.

CHANNING'S WORKS,

Being Discourses, Reviews, and Miscellanies. 8vo. pp. 600.

This Edition contains the same matter as the first. It is intended, however, for a more general circulation; the price is therefore reduced to \$1.50, which makes it one of the cheapest works now before the public.

THE NEW YORK COLLECTION OF PSALMS AND HYMNS for Social and Private Worship. Third Edition.

Societies and others wishing for this Collection, can be furnished, by the quantity, on reasonable terms.

A NEW TRANSLATION of the BOOK OF PSALMS, with an Introduction. By GEORGE R. NOYES, Author of a 'Translation of the Book of Job.'

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

Nº. LXIII.

NEW SERIES—Nº. XXXIII.

JULY, 1834.

- ART. I.—1. *The Life of William Roscoe*, by his Son HENRY ROSCOE. In Two Volumes. London. T. Cadell. 1833. 8vo. pp. 501 and 491.
2. *American Edition of the same Work*. 12mo. 2 vols. Boston. Russell, Odiorne, & Metcalf. 1833. pp. 370 and 374.

EVELYN, Beattie, and others, have been called to the mournful office of raising memorials to the virtues and talents of their children; and we have sorrowed with them over the tombs of piety and genius which have “faded timelessly.” Our sympathies are as strongly, though not so sadly excited in behalf of those children, who, as in the instance before us, perform the filial duty of building monuments to the blessed memory of their fathers. This seems to be more according to the course of nature. There are no early blights and disappointments to deplore. The grain has been gathered “in full season.”

It is not always that an eminent man leaves behind him a child, or near relative, who is capable of doing justice to his memory. This happiness has fallen to the lot of two friends who in their lifetime were united by similar tastes and opinions, literary, political, and religious, and who died within a few years of each other. Among the biographies which have been lately given to the public, few are so interesting as that of Sir James Edward Smith by his wife, and that of William Roscoe by his son.

On several accounts Mr. Roscoe seemed to be nearer to us than any of those distinguished persons whose deaths

have been announced to us from abroad in such rapid succession. The place of his abode was Liverpool, the great port of our English commerce, and the spot where those who leave us for health and the various other purposes of foreign travel, first greet the English soil. Here he was the life and soul of all that was literary, scientific, benevolent, and refined, the only name which the world knew, and, at least for a time, the only individual who redeemed the city from the charge of absolute dullness and darkness in every respect but that of trade. To him, therefore, our travellers sought to be introduced, and his reception of them was always such as increased the respect which they had before entertained for him. We all remember the enthusiastic description given of him by Washington Irving, in the beginning of his "Sketch Book." What he has expressed, every American of taste was wont to feel on being made acquainted with the historian of Lorenzo de' Medici and Leo X.

But this was not all. The liberality of Mr. Roscoe's mind and sentiments was such as to attract our peculiar regards. He was not only distinguished as an author and a literary man, but as a true, zealous, indefatigable philanthropist. He loved his fellow creatures; and no prejudices, no feudal notions, no aristocratic predilections, stood between him and his love. He was the staunch friend of free institutions. Oppression ever found in him an enemy, and human rights an advocate. To the great subjects of slavery, war, and prison discipline he devoted the healthy energies of his mind; his opinions in relation to them were those of the enlightened Christian; and his correspondence on the last topic especially, with gentlemen of this country, had doubtless no small share in perfecting that system in which we are allowed to excel other nations, and to which other nations are beginning to turn their attention as to a model.

And further, Mr. Roscoe was the friend of Americans and of their country. With a proper understanding of our deficiencies, he was a warm admirer of our merits and improvements. He easily pardoned us for not being so far advanced in literature, science, and luxurious refinements as some older countries. He bore with us in our habit of boasting, and acknowledged that it was rightfully ours by natural descent. He was not surprised to hear us talk tolerably good English, and did not expect to see our country-

men walking the streets of Liverpool in feathers and moccasins, and bearing bow and quiver. He was acquainted with our institutions. He was acquainted with our distinguished men, and did not affect to despise them. He seemed to have obtained almost as clear and correct ideas of our country as if he had actually seen it. And this was because he was a man of sense, of a fair mind, and of an honorable and charitable heart, and condescended to be informed, and took pains to inform himself. O that he could have come here! We then should have reckoned one traveller, who, if he had seen fit to report his observations, would have spoken of us candidly and with discrimination, and would neither have disgusted us with ignorant and wholesale praise, nor have been implacably offended with us on account of some little, indifferent habits, to which he was unaccustomed. But such a blessing we have yet to wait for, and meanwhile must be content with being misrepresented in the way both of flattery and abuse.

Mr. Roscoe was a virtuous and religious man, and as such possesses still higher claims on our remembrance. His life was remarkably pure as well as useful. His domestic character was delightful; his private influence most benign. He was penetrated with a constant sense of an overruling and paternal Providence. He was an humble and observant follower of the sinless one. He did not forget by whom his talents were bestowed. He did not employ his genius, as so many have done, in the miserable work of rebellion against its inspiring Source. He presented that most noble and consistent spectacle, a gifted man devoting his powers to the service of their Giver. His conduct, manners, and writings were alike irreproachable.

And, lastly, we should be unjust to him and to ourselves, if we omitted to state, in this enumeration of the bonds between us, that his views of Christianity were the same with our own. His reason, seriously applied to the study of the Scriptures, made him a Unitarian, and his conscience told him to avow his belief openly and without fear. He did not, as too many of his countrymen do, continue to cling to the established church, in spite of his convictions, because conformity is fashionable, or genteel, or profitable; but, being a Unitarian, he went to a Unitarian church, and there worshipped the Father in spirit and in truth; and

though he did not obtrude his opinions, and was uniformly charitable toward those with whom he could not agree, he was never unwilling to profess his faith, nor unable to give a reason for it. How can we help loving such a man, so honest, so free, so imbued with integrity of purpose, so superior to worldly and selfish considerations? And how brightly does his example contrast with the conduct of those, who make religion subservient to policy, — a miserable policy too.

We have offered a few considerations which unite in rendering the biography of Roscoe peculiarly interesting to us. We shall now proceed to lay before our readers a sketch of his life, drawn from the two volumes in which his son has preserved its records.

William Roscoe was born in Liverpool, on the 8th of March, 1753. He was the only son of William and Elizabeth Roscoe, who had also an only daughter, Margaret, who was married to Daniel Daulby, Esq. His father kept a public house, and cultivated a market garden, and was fond of field sports and other amusements, a taste for which did not descend to his son, who was formed in a gentler and nobler mould. His remoter ancestors do not seem to have been of any higher rank in the world than his father; a circumstance which was so far from troubling him, that he made it a matter of good-natured pleasantry, telling the Garter King at Arms, when he met him in London, that as nothing was known of his humble forefathers, and as he himself had six sons, he thought he was an unobjectionable person to stand at the head of a family. "Amongst my new acquaintances," he says in a letter written in the year 1797 to his brother-in-law, Mr. Daulby, "is Sir Isaac Heard, who has been extremely civil to me; and is desirous of tracing the pedigree of the noble family of the Roscoes, which has hitherto, I find, baffled all his researches. I told him I was a good patriarch, and the proper person to *begin* a family, as I had six sons, &c. Accordingly, the whole descent is registered, and the Roscoes and Daulbys may now go on *in sæcula sæculorum*. Amen." On this subject he doubtless coincided in opinion with old Joshua Sylvester, who thus sets forth in an Epigram "The true Honour of the truly Honourable."

“Neither the birth drawn through in long descent,
From noble, royall, or imperiall race ;
Neither the match, with houses eminent,
When heirs with heirs, their arms with arms they grace ;
Neither possession of a princely rent,
With sumptuous service in a stately place ;
Are honours reall (being right defined)
But reall virtues and a royall minde.”

Of the childhood and early youth of Mr. Roscoe he has himself given a short account in an epistle to a friend, which is preserved by his biographer. One of the first things which he remembers is “a decided aversion to compulsion and restraint.” This, to be sure, is not uncommon in children ; but in him it was the dawning of that love of virtuous liberty, which afterwards enlightened his whole character. From first to last it may be said of him, that his soul,

“ — though touched with human sympathies,
Revolted at oppression.”

At the age of six he was put under the tuition of a Mr. Martin, who kept a school for boys in Liverpool. “To his care,” he says, “and the instructions of a *kind and affectionate mother*, I believe I may safely attribute any good principles which may have appeared in my conduct during my future life. It is to her I owe the inculcation of those sentiments of humanity, which became a principle in my mind. Nor did she neglect to supply me with such books as she thought would contribute to my literary improvement.” Here is another instance added to the many which history records, of the power which maternal influence has exerted in forming great and good men. So much has been said by others of this influence, which we hold to be only next to Heaven’s own, that we shall merely remark, that if it is so beneficial, so beautiful, so nearly divine in its operation, how contented should mothers be with its exercise, and how culpable those mothers are, who, in the eager pursuit of folly and fashion, are losing the rich opportunity of earning, it may be, the world’s blessing, by training up their offspring to virtue and usefulness. Elizabeth Roscoe, the innkeeper’s wife at the “Bowling-Green,” had little reason to envy the equipages which rolled past her door, or to sigh for a more extended sphere of duty or display, while she was guiding the mind and guarding the

heart of a beloved boy, who was by and by to take his place among the most distinguished writers and eminent philanthropists of his age.

After remaining about two years with Mr. Martin, young Roscoe was removed to another school, where he continued till he was twelve years of age. The germs of a poetical temperament and a humane disposition were now fast unfolding.

"According to my best recollection, I was at this period of my life of a wild, rambling, and unsocial disposition; passing many of my hours in strolling along the shore of the river Mersey, or in fishing, or in taking long walks alone. On one occasion, I determined to become a sportsman; and, having procured a gun, and found an unfortunate thrush perched on the branch of a tree, I brought him to the ground with fatal aim; but I was so horrified and disgusted with the agonies I saw him endure in death, that I have never since repeated the experiment." — Vol. i. pp. 7, 8.

He now began to be of service to his father in the garden; and often carried potatoes to Liverpool market for sale, on his head, in a large basket, and was entrusted with the disposal of them.

"In this and other laborious occupations, particularly in the care of a garden, in which I took great pleasure, I passed several years of my life, devoting my hours of relaxation to reading my books. This mode of life gave health and vigor to my body, and amusement and instruction to my mind; and to this day I well remember the delicious sleep which succeeded my labors, from which I was again called at an early hour. If I were now asked whom I consider to be happiest of the human race, I should answer, those who cultivate the earth by their own hands." — pp. 8, 9.

Being called upon in his fifteenth year to make choice of a profession, his attachment to reading induced him to prefer that of a bookseller, but, on being apprenticed accordingly, he soon grew tired of it. In the following year, 1769, he was articled for six years to an attorney and solicitor, and thus entered on the study of the law, but still devoted what time he could spare to the perusal of poets and other authors who fell in his way, among whom Shennstone and Goldsmith were his favorites. About this time he had the misfortune to lose his excellent mother.

Among the early companions of Mr. Roscoe, one is particularly noticed, as excelling in all accomplishments of body and mind. His name was Francis Holden, and it was by him that Mr. Roscoe's attention was first directed to the study of the Italian language and literature. It was at this early period, and while engaged in this course of study, that the idea of writing the life of Lorenzo de' Medici presented itself to his mind.

Another of Mr. Roscoe's friends at this time, but of the gentler sex, was Miss Maria Done, who was afterwards married to Mr. John Barton. This lady had great literary taste, and a talent for poetry. "Her son, Mr. Bernard Barton, to whom her poetical talents have descended, and her daughter, Mrs. Hack, the author of many valuable works for children, are well known in the literary world."

In the year 1773, Mr. Roscoe became one of the founders of a Society for the Encouragement of the Arts of Painting and Design, in Liverpool, and commemorated the event by an Ode which was his first published piece. The following comparison between the great masters of poetry and painting is well imagined, and shows the early taste of the author for both those arts.

"Majestic, nervous, bold, and strong,
Let Angelo with Milton vie ;
Opposed to Waller's amorous song,
His art let wanton Titian try ;
Let great Romano's free design
Contend with Dryden's pompous line ;
And chaste Correggio's graceful air
With Pope's unblemished page compare ;
Lorraine may rival Thomson's name ;
And Hogarth equal Butler's fame ;
And still, where'er the aspiring Muse
Her wide unbounded flight pursues,
Her sister soars on kindred wings sublime,
And gives her favorite names to grace the rolls of time." — p. 23.

Before he had attained his twentieth year, he published a longer poem, entitled "Mount Pleasant," which was the name of an eminence overlooking the town of Liverpool. This poem obtained the praise of Dr. Enfield, the poet Mason, and Sir Joshua Reynolds, and is remarkable as containing the author's first public protest against the Slave Trade. He also composed a tract in prose about the same

period, to which he gave the title of "Christian Morality, as contained in the Precepts of the New Testament, in the language of Jesus Christ." The work was divided into three heads ; Duty to God ; Duty to our Fellow Creatures ; and Duty to ourselves. Each head consisted of precepts of our Saviour, connected together by a few short illustrations and reflections. As his two former productions were evidence of his correct literary taste, so the latter afforded proof of a maturity of religious sentiment and knowledge, remarkable in so young a man. "It is, perhaps, worthy of notice," observes his son, "that in 1831, when Mr. Roscoe had the pleasure of a personal introduction to Rammohun Roy, he had the satisfaction of showing to the author of the 'Precepts of Jesus,' the youthful production of his first religious inquiries and impressions."

Having completed his clerkship, Mr. Roscoe was admitted, in 1774, an attorney of the Court of King's Bench, and commenced the practice of his profession at Liverpool. On the 22d of February, 1781, he was married to Miss Jane Griffies, a lady to whom he had been attached for several years, and whose literary taste, good sense, amiable dispositions, and correct principles harmonized with his own character and pursuits, and made her a help meet for him.

In the spring of the year 1782, Mr. Roscoe visited London on professional business, where he took the opportunity of adding, as far as prudence permitted, to his small collection of books and prints, and where he became acquainted with several distinguished men. A year or two afterwards, he wrote a poem, which was never published, called "The Origin of Engraving." In this poem some lines occur, which show that his mind was yet occupied on the subject which was afterwards treated by his pen with such eminent success. We give a part of these lines, as they are quoted by his biographer, together with Mr. Roscoe's note to one of them. The writer is speaking of the art of painting.

"Long drooped the sacred art,—but rose at length
With brighter lustre and redoubled strength ;
When great Lorenzo,* 'midst his mild domain,
Led the gay Muses and their kindred train ;

"* Lorenzo de' Medici, called the Magnificent, (born in 1448, died in 1492,) was the director of the Florentine republic for upwards of

Then, as the bard the imagined story drew,
The kindling artist bade it rise to view;
Till the strong comment shamed the sister art,
And found a nearer passage to the heart." — p. 50.

In the years 1787 and 1788, Mr. Roscoe published the first and second parts of his "*Wrongs of Africa*," a poem in which he manfully continued his opposition to that traffic which above all others has been branded with the epithet *accursed*. His high and true heroism in being so active in this cause may be in some measure estimated from the following remarks by his son.

"The African slave-trade constituted, at this period, a great part of the commerce of Liverpool. A numerous body of merchants and ship-owners, and a still more formidable array of masters of vessels, and sailors, looked to the continuance of that traffic for their emolument or their support. The wealth and prosperity of the town were supposed to depend chiefly upon this branch of commerce, and there were few persons whose interests were not, directly or indirectly, connected with the prosecution of it. Even those whose employments had no reference to commercial objects, found their opinions and feelings with regard to the traffic necessarily affected by the tone of the society in which they mingled. Under these circumstances it was hardly to be expected that Liverpool should be the place from which a voice should be heard appealing to the world on behalf of the captive African. Fortunately, however, the mind of Mr. Roscoe remained unshackled by the prejudices or the interests of those around him, nor did any motives of a personal nature operate to prevent the expression of his opinions. He had been gifted with those strong feelings of abhorrence to injustice, and of resistance to oppression, which are the great moral engines bestowed by God upon man for the maintenance of his virtue and his freedom. The 'aversion to compulsion,' recorded by Mr. Roscoe as one of his earliest characteristics, led him in his youth to form very

twenty years, and the father of John de' Medici, afterwards pope, by the name of Leo X. To the munificence and taste of Lorenzo is principally to be attributed the sudden progress of the fine arts in Italy at the close of the fifteenth century. But this is only a small part of his praise. If a full enquiry be made into his life and character, he will appear to be not only one of the most extraordinary, but, perhaps, upon the whole, the most extraordinary man that any age or nation has produced."

decided opinions upon this question, which, in his after life, occupied much of his attention, and in which he had ultimately the gratification of knowing that he had labored not unsuccessfully." — pp. 54, 55.

At the same period he published a pamphlet on the same important subject, entitled, "*A General View of the African Slave Trade, demonstrating its Injustice and Impolicy ; with Hints towards a Bill for its Abolition.*" This excited great attention, and was much commended by the friends of the cause of freedom ; and yet more praise was elicited by an answer which he published a few months afterwards, to a work called "*Scriptural Researches on the Licitness of the Slave-Trade,*" written by a Rev. Raymond Harris, a clergyman of the Church of England, who had been educated for the Catholic priesthood. In speaking of this work of Harris's, Dr. Currie, habitually a most moderate man in all his thoughts and expressions, could not contain his anger. "A little scoundrel," says he, "a Spanish Jesuit, has advanced to the assistance of the slave-merchants, and has published a vindication of this traffic from the Old Testament." He also says that the work was "egregiously false and sophistical." Mr. Roscoe's answer to it was considered triumphant. It immediately attracted the attention of the London Abolition Committee, who took all the remaining copies, and ordered another edition to be printed. "It is the work of a master," says his friend, Mr. Barton, "and by much the best answer Harris has received."

Mr. Roscoe now began to engage himself pretty actively in politics ; from no interested motives, however, but because he found it impossible to remain a quiet spectator of the excitement produced in England by the accounts of the commencement and progress of the French Revolution. It is hardly worth while to state which side he espoused, it is so evident from what has already been exhibited of his principles, that he must have joined the friends of rational freedom, and enemies of arrogant despotism. He went into the controversy heart and hand, and, as usual, brought his pen to the contest in poetry and prose. At a meeting held in Liverpool to celebrate the taking of the Bastille, on the 14th of July, 1790, he produced a song which became quite popular, beginning, "Unfold, Father Time ! thy long records unfold ;" and on a similar occasion, the next year, he

brought forward his more successful and better remembered song, "O'er the vine covered hills and gay regions of France." At this period he engaged in correspondence with some of the most distinguished men of the liberal party, among whom was the Marquis of Lansdowne. As the French Revolution went on, he, with all other good men, was shocked and even dismayed by the excesses and atrocities which were every day committed; but he did not, on that account, conceive it necessary that he should forsake his principles, as many did, and go over to the favorers of arbitrary government. The remarks which are made on this subject by his son, appear to us so just as well as eloquent, that we cannot forbear extracting them.

"As the revolution proceeded, — as the confidence of the people in the sincerity of the king decreased, — as the passions of various parties became more and more exasperated, — as the threats of foreign interference were redoubled, the aspect of political affairs in France grew darker and darker. It now became evident that despotism, amongst its most hateful qualities, possesses that of rendering those who suffer under its influence unfit for the wise enjoyment of freedom, until after a long and too often a sanguinary education; — that it is vain to expect from slaves, the discretion, the forbearance, and the magnanimity of freemen; and that the fatal retribution of the crimes of governments is found in the madness of the people. The oppression of the atmosphere is carried off in lightnings and in storms, and despotism expires in tumults and in blood. The crimes of the French revolution have been by many absurdly charged on those alone by whose hands they were committed; while their governors, who had industriously extirpated the principles and feelings which would have prevented such excesses, have been represented as their martyrs. Time, and calm reflection, will teach the better lesson, that, to render a people humane, just, and moderate, their government must first set them an example of humanity, of justice, and of moderation." — pp. 80, 81.

Mr. Burke's "Two Letters to a Member of Parliament," were answered by Mr. Roscoe in a pamphlet containing "Strictures" on those letters; and as he was aware that ridicule is often as formidable a weapon as argument, he assailed his great antagonist in a ballad, entitled "The Life, Death, and wonderful Achievements of Edmund Burke." He represents Burke, in this ballad, as a knight-errant;

and the famous quarrel which took place in the House of Commons between him and Fox, is thus described ; —

“ Full tilt he ran at all he met,
And round he dealt his knocks,
Till, with a backward stroke at last,
He hit poor Charley Fox.

“ Now Charley was, of all his friends,
The warmest friend he had ;
So when he felt this graceless blow,
He deemed the man was mad.

“ With grief his generous bosom rose,
A grief too great to hide ;
And as the stroke was somewhat hard,
He sat him down and cried.

“ But not a whit did Edmund feel ;
For at his friend he flew,
Resolved, before the neighbours round,
To beat him black and blue.

“ Then Charles indignant started up,
The meagre form he took,
And with a giant's awful grasp
His rusty armour shook.

“ Oh, have ye seen a mastiff strong
A shivering lap-dog tear ? —
Then may ye judge how Edmund did,
When clawed by Charles, appear.” — p. 88.

Amidst the storms of politics, however, Mr. Roscoe did not lose his taste for the calm pursuits of literature, or for the pleasures of the country and agricultural occupations. About the year 1792, he formed the design of reclaiming and cultivating an extensive tract of moss-land in the neighbourhood of Manchester ; and in order to obtain a lease of it he visited London in the winter of that year, in company with his friend, Mr. Thomas Wakefield, who had joined him in the enterprise. Two years before this, he had removed from Liverpool, and taken a house pleasantly situated at Toxteth Park, about two miles from town. He was attracted to this place of residence by a beautiful

dingle which stretched on to the shores of the Mersey, and which he has celebrated by an "Inscription," beginning "Stranger! that with careless feet," which seems to us to be the most pleasing of his poetical essays. In 1793, he left this situation, and removed to Birchfield, also in the vicinity of Liverpool, where he erected a house for himself.

Previously to the last named removal, Mr. Roscoe had applied himself seriously and diligently to the execution of his long cherished design of writing the life of Lorenzo de' Medici. The obstacles in his way, arising from the great quantity of necessary materials, published and unpublished, and the difficulty of procuring them, were many and great. Many books he had obtained by busy search into all the book-stalls and shops of London; and the Crevenna and Pinelli libraries, being on sale at this time, supplied him with many more. But the rich stores contained in the literary repositories of Italy were still inaccessible, and his engagements at home prevented his taking a journey to the continent for the purpose of personal examination. Perhaps he might have been discouraged by this, had it not been that an intimate friend of his, Mr. William Clarke, was residing for the winter at Florence, for the sake of his health, who became of the greatest service to him, by sending him the titles of such books as he supposed he might require, and by causing extracts to be taken from many valuable manuscripts which existed in the great Florentine libraries, relating to the history of the Medici family. Among the unpublished pieces thus transmitted to him, were many original poems of Lorenzo de' Medici, a small collection of which he sent to the press in 1791, as a sort of avant-courier to his *Life*, limiting the number of copies to twelve, to be distributed amongst his literary friends. This volume was appropriately dedicated, in the Italian language, to his friend Mr. Clarke.

The first sheets of the *Life of Lorenzo* were committed to the press in the autumn of the year 1793, and in February, 1796, it was published by Mr. Edwards of Pall Mall, who soon wrote the author word that the whole of a parcel containing fifty copies, which had been sent from Liverpool, had gone off in three days, and that he was "most cruelly teased for more." Compliments and encomiums poured in upon the historian from all quarters; notes of thanks and gratulation

were received from old Lord Orford (Horace Walpole), the Earl of Bristol, the Marquis of Lansdowne, Dr. Parr, Sir Samuel Romilly, Dr. Aikin, and others; in short, the success of the work was brilliant and complete. "Assured on all hands," writes Lord Lansdowne, "of the success of '*Lorenzo de' Medici*,' which has been far beyond any book I remember (and Mr. Hume's publication of his first volumes is within my memory), we determined to reserve it till we went to Wycombe, and could have the full enjoyment of it free from interruption; and I can venture to assure you that, great as our prejudice was in its favor, it exceeded our expectation." "I have heard but one opinion of it," are the words of Dr. Aikin, "that it is the most elegant and interesting publication of the literary kind, that has appeared in our language for many years."

Mr. Roscoe published the first edition of his work on his own account. Soon after its appearance Messrs. Cadell and Davies offered him twelve hundred pounds for the copyright, which offer was accepted. Those gentlemen speedily put a second edition to the press, which was followed by another in 1799.

On the continent the success of the "*Life*" was answerable to its reception at home. A translation of it was made in Italy by the Cavaliero Gaetano Mecherini, and was published in 1799. In Germany it was translated into the language of that country by Kurt Sprengel, a celebrated medical professor at Halle. The work appeared in 1797. Two years afterwards, a French translation by M. François Thurot was published in Paris.

In America, an edition of the "*Life*" was printed at Philadelphia in the year 1803, and was quickly disposed of. Perhaps there was nearly as much enthusiasm in regard to it, at that time and for several years after, in this country as in England. The excitement has now, of course, subsided, but the work occupies an honorable place in the library of every lover of history and elegant literature.

It is not to be wondered at, that a man of Mr. Roscoe's taste should grow tired of his profession, though it was the one which he had chosen for a support. The two following extracts from letters to his friends, Mr. Ralph Eddowes of Philadelphia, and Mr. Rathbone of Liverpool, give the reasons for his leaving it, and also furnish pleasant specimens

of his epistolary style. The first is addressed to Mr. Ed-
dowes.

“ ‘Since I last addressed you, I have made a very important change, though not a local one, and have entirely relinquished my profession; having, however, first made an arrangement with my late partner, Mr. Lace, productive of some advantage to me. This I have been induced to do rather from a concurrence of many reasons, than from any one predominant circumstance; but I must, in truth, confess that a consciousness that I was not suited for the profession, nor the profession for me, has long hung about me, and that I have taken the first opportunity which has been allowed me of divesting myself of it altogether. Add to this, that my undertaking in the draining of Chat and Trafford mosses bears a favorable aspect; and that I shall be under the necessity of being so frequently absent from Liverpool, as would render it impossible for me to carry on the business of the law with satisfaction either to my clients or myself.’

“ A note to Mr. Rathbone, written about the same time as the preceding letter, manifests very clearly the tone of Mr. Roscoe’s mind at the period of this change.

“ ‘I am much obliged by the tailpiece to your letter of to-day, though, to say the truth, it amounts to nothing more than calling me (in very friendly terms) an idle and extravagant fellow, who is playing off the artful trick of getting hold of the conveniences and pleasures of life without performing any of its duties. This I relish the worse, as I am not sure that there is not some degree of truth in it; but I am much surer, that to toil and labor for the sake of laboring and toiling, is a much more foolish part; and that it is the curse of God upon avarice, that he who has given himself up too long to its dominion, shall never be able to extricate himself from its chains. Surely man is the most foolish of all animals, and civilized man the most foolish of all men. Anticipation is his curse; and to prevent the contingency of evil, he makes life itself only one continued evil. Health, wisdom, peace of mind, conscience, are all sacrificed to the absurd purpose of heaping up, for the use of life, more than life can employ, under the flimsy pretext of providing for his children, till practice becomes habit, and we labor on till we are obliged to take our departure, as tired of this world as we are unprepared for the rational happiness of the next.

“ ‘I have much more to say to you on this subject, but this is not the place for it. I shall therefore leave you to your

“ Double double,
Toil and trouble,
Fire burn, and caldron bubble,”

whilst I go to the arrangement of the fifth class of my plants, and take my chance of a few years in a work-house, some fifty years hence, which I shall think well compensated by having had the lot to live so long.' " — pp. 152, 153.

The relinquishment of his profession by Mr. Roscoe took place in 1796. He had some idea of resuming it, on making a visit to London the next year, and even went so far as to be entered at Gray's Inn, but he soon gave up the design altogether. It was at this time that he made the acquaintance of Sir Isaac Heard. An interesting fact relating to General Washington, is recorded in connexion with this acquaintance.

"Amongst the persons with whom Mr. Roscoe at this time became acquainted, was the late Sir Isaac Heard, Garter principal King at Arms. This acquaintance led him to the knowledge of a singular fact respecting General Washington, which he afterwards communicated to an American gentleman in the following letter: — 'I have now the pleasure of performing my promise of repeating to you, by letter, the information I gave you in Liverpool, respecting the memorial of General Washington and his family, drawn up in his own hand-writing, and sent by him to the late Sir Isaac Heard, Garter King at Arms, to be enrolled by him in the records of the Heralds' College, London.

"'It is now about thirty years since I had the good fortune to form an acquaintance with Sir Isaac Heard, who was a kind friend, an excellent patriot, and, I need scarcely add, a very worthy man. On visiting him one day in his office in Doctors' Commons, I observed a portrait over the chimney-piece, not sufficiently characterized for me to decipher, and to the best of my recollection, not in the first style of art.

"'I could, however, perceive that it was not the representation of the personage who might have been expected to preside at the fountain of honor; and on expressing my surprise to Sir Isaac, and enquiring whose portrait it was, he replied in his usual energetic manner, "Whose is it? Whose should it be? but the portrait of the greatest man of the age, — General Washington." On my assenting to this remark, he added, "Now, Sir, I will show you something farther." And turning to his archives he took out some papers, consisting of several sheets closely written, saying, "Here, Sir, is the genealogy and family history of General Washington, with which he has, at my request, furnished me, in his own hand-writing, and which I shall have a particular pleasure in preserving amongst the most precious records of my office;" which I have no doubt he

has accordingly done, and where I presume they may still be seen on application to the proper authorities.' " — pp. 159, 160.

The singularity of this account may be explained by the fact, that Sir Isaac Heard had connexions in America, and had resided for some time in Boston.

Not long after Mr. Roscoe had relinquished his profession, in which he had been laboriously engaged for upwards of twenty years, he was enabled to purchase Allerton Hall, a beautiful old manor about six miles from Liverpool. And here he thought that he should be able to spend the rest of life in the pursuit of his literary, botanical, and agricultural tastes. But he soon felt himself obliged by the claims of friendship, to become an active partner in the extensive banking establishment of the Clarkes, whose affairs he had been instrumental in adjusting, when they were in a state of considerable embarrassment. He was thus thrown again into the midst of affairs, and for a short time the engagements of his new situation "almost put a complete stop to his literary labors." By and by, however, as this pressure was gradually alleviated, he returned in corresponding degrees to his cherished pursuits. He resumed his labors on the "*Life of Leo X.*", the design of writing which he had for some time entertained, and he prosecuted afresh his botanical studies. There being at this period considerable attention paid to botany in Liverpool, he joined with several of his friends in the establishment of a Botanic Garden, which was opened in the summer of 1802; and which soon became celebrated for its scientific value, as well as for its beauty. His connexion with this institution led him into a correspondence with Sir James Edward Smith, who, in 1803, paid a visit to Allerton, when a friendship was commenced between these two accomplished and excellent men, which was strengthened every year, and continued uninterrupted till the death of the latter, — perhaps we ought to say, was not even then interrupted.

In 1805, Mr. Roscoe was called to mourn the death of his friend Dr. Currie; and but a short time elapsed, before another dear friend, his early literary associate, Mr. Clarke, was taken away from him. He was deeply affected by these events, and an extract from one of his letters will show the religious temper with which he regarded them.

" ' Surely, the misery that usually attends the close of life affords one of the strongest proofs of a future state of exist-

ence. For how is it possible to suppose that the same Supreme Being, who has distributed such various and extensive happiness to his creatures, would finally conclude the whole with pain and distress? This view of the subject is the only one that can afford us any real consolation, either for the sufferings of our friends, or for those which we must experience ourselves. After a life evidently intended to exercise our virtues, and improve our moral powers, death may be considered as the last great trial of our fortitude; the display of which, as it exhibits a complete triumph over the weakness of human nature, seems the best calculated to terminate our labors in this world, and accompany us on our entrance into the next. In the mean time, we who survive are like soldiers in an army, who, as their ranks are thinned by the enemy, draw nearer to each other.' " — pp. 212, 213.

It was not till the spring of 1806, that Mr. Roscoe enjoyed the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Dr. Parr, though he had for some years occasionally corresponded with him. The visit of the old Grecian to Allerton was afterwards the subject of a letter from him, which, though short, is as good a specimen of his style, in its simpler form, as we remember to have seen. It also says much for the warmth of his heart.

" 'Dear Mr. Roscoe,

" 'I am now in my sixtieth year. I have conversed with the wisest and most learned of my contemporaries, and I say to you with great sincerity, that the days I spent with you, and your family, were amongst the happiest days of my life. I shall remember you; I shall esteem you; I shall praise you; I shall bless you, one and all, again and again. Yes, dear Sir, I am thankful to Heaven for granting me such an intellectual and such a moral repast. I shall again be thankful, if I am permitted again to see you, and your wife, and your children.' " — pp. 222, 223.

The "Life of Leo X.," which had been in the press upwards of two years, appeared before the public in the summer of 1805, in four quarto volumes, and the whole edition, consisting of a thousand copies, was soon disposed of. Generally it was received with the same favor which had greeted the publication of "Lorenzo"; but some complained that it was prolix, and the Edinburgh Review treated it with the harshness which was then, more than at present, its habit. Against the charge of prolixity Mr. Roscoe defended himself, by stating, that he had collected many original facts and

documents of importance; and that it was impossible to do justice to these, and to the great variety of subjects necessarily involved in his task, without seeming tedious to many readers. In our opinion the defence is perfectly sound. There is no doubt, that the liberality of opinion constantly expressed by the historian, especially in treating of the Reformation, operated to his disadvantage in many minds which were more narrow than his own; but as time rolls on, and opinion grows more free, this circumstance will prove one of the chief and most fragrant ingredients in embalming his work. To the unfavorable criticisms which had appeared, Mr. Roscoe prepared a reply; but on consideration he gave up the idea of printing it, conceiving it unnecessary to defend a work which had been received with approbation by the most competent judges. The concluding paragraph of the manuscript is preserved by his son, and it appears to us strongly affecting in its noble simplicity.

“ ‘ With this publication, to which I have been reluctantly impelled, by the just defence of myself and my writings, I take a final and a grateful leave of the public in the character of a literary historian, — a character which I have been led to assume, rather by accidental circumstances, than by preparatory studies or deliberate intention. Having now laid before them what I had to communicate, I have finished my task, and return with fresh ardor to the humbler but not unimportant occupations of private life. If my productions should still continue to experience the indulgence of my readers, few of them will be inclined to deny that I have now written enough. If the censures of my opponents be well founded, I have long since written too much; yet I would gladly flatter myself in the hope that my writings may preserve some faint memorial of their author, and may exhibit him as the friend of liberal studies, the admirer of whatever is excellent in the human character, and the advocate of truth, of liberty, and of virtue.’ ”
— p. 254.

As was the case with “Lorenzo,” so “Leo X.,” was translated into the German, Italian, and French languages; and was republished in Philadelphia. Boston, though a literary place always, comparatively speaking, was not then the literary mart that it is now.

We next see Mr. Roscoe again and more prominently on the stage of politics. He was requested by his friends in Liverpool, just before the general election of 1806, to stand

as candidate for Parliament, and he consented. His opponents were the old members, Generals Gascoyne and Tarleton, and, at the end of a severe contest of seven days, he beat the military gentlemen by a good majority. His career at St. Stephen's was a useful, though a short and not a brilliant one. He particularly discharged his conscience and gratified his feelings, by speaking against the Slave-Trade, and voting for its abolition; a measure which was accomplished by that parliament of which he was a member. Parliament was dissolved in the spring of 1807; various political circumstances contributed to his defeat at the next election, and he returned without regret to private life. The following extract from a letter to Sir J. E. Smith obliges us to believe that he returned even with joy.

“ ‘I have for some time past rejoiced in the thought that I am likely to see you in Lancashire in the course of the present summer. I already anticipate the happiness I shall have in your society at Allerton, where I must at least claim some portion of your time, and where I shall be delighted to stroll and saunter with you through the fields in an evening, instead of being locked up, balloting for committees, in St. Stephen's. In truth, my dear friend, it requires but little of the efforts of others to drive me from public life. The only wonder is, that I was ever brought into it; and I sink back with such a rapidity of gravitation into my natural inclination for quiet and retirement, that I totally despair of ever being roused again to a similar exertion. Add to this, that the one great object which was continually before my eyes is now attained, and I shall have the perpetual gratification of thinking that I gave my vote in the assembly of the nation, for abolishing the slave-trade to Africa. Though not insensible to the state of the country, yet I see no question of equal magnitude; and am fully aware how little my efforts could avail in the political struggles of the times. Come then, my friend, and let us again open the book of nature, and wander through the fields of science. Your presence will increase my reviving relish for botanical pursuits; and when we are tired with those subjects, we will call in the aid of the poets and philosophers to vary our entertainments.’ ”
— p. 302.

But though no longer in a public station, Mr. Roscoe could not so far withdraw himself from politics as not to feel deeply interested in the stirring events of the times, and not to express his opinions with openness and force. Through the whole of Pitt's warlike administration, he was the steady

opponent of that minister, and undazzled by successes abroad, and unintimidated by the popular voice at home, which is in all countries secured by military glory, he remained the unflinching advocate of peace, peace for his own country, and peace, on general principles, for the world. His pamphlets were among the best which the times called forth. That his pacific efforts had no effect in disposing the public mind to peace, gave him great pain. Having expressed his mournful feelings in a letter to Sir Philip Francis, the latter replied in a style which may induce some of our readers to believe that it is not without reason that he has been supposed to be, among many other candidates, the author of the "Letters of Junius."

"I am not surprised at your giving up all hope of the country, much less at your intention to withdraw yourself from political discussion. An author whom I greatly respect has told me "that in all ages the rage of popular violence has been principally directed against the best friends and benefactors of mankind." So, if you are fortunate enough to escape unpunished from the public service, you must be satisfied with impunity, and consider it as a reward. There may, probably, be an exception in your favor, but the general rules of human justice are against you. The only traveller I know of, whose veracity is not to be suspected, informs us that, in the island of Glubdubdrib, he had an opportunity of conversing with the spirits of the dead; and he says, that "having read of some great services done to princes and states, he desired to see the persons by whom those services were performed. On inquiry, he was told that their names were to be found on no record, except a few of them whom history hath represented as the vilest rogues and traitors. As to the rest, he had never once heard of them. They all appeared with dejected looks, and in the meanest habit; most of them telling him they died in poverty and disgrace, and the rest of them on a scaffold or a gibbet." Nevertheless, if you believe, as I do, that great faculties are given in trust, and that duty may survive hope, I cannot allow you to quit your station. The very worst of all the symptoms in the present case, is the universal indifference of the country to the dangers that surround it. Something must be done to rouse the people and bring them to their senses; and I, for one, shall look to you for some great contribution to that service. While I am here at Lord Thanet's, I shall read and study all your tracts again. You cannot give me wealth or power; but you can, and shall, give instruction. I will not

suffer you to forget me, if I can help it. I would rather have accompanied Charles Fox to his grave, and into it, *egenus et exul uterque*, than have been witness to what I heard and saw in the last six months of his life. He missed the moment — *e curru descendens Teutonico*. He might have commanded, as you will do, his own Euthanasia. To my knowledge, more than twenty years of his life were heroic. Farewell, dear sir; do not yet despair of the Republic.' " — pp. 358, 359.

In following the course of Mr. Roscoe's life, one cannot fail to be struck with the expansiveness, the fine humanity, and what may be called the ultimate truth of his opinions, on every great subject to which he gave his attention. Such were his opinions on slavery, on peace, on elections and parliamentary reform. They were opinions which are more and more acknowledged to be true, as time passes on and men grow enlightened; opinions which are founded on the divine principles of Christianity, and on a just and benevolent understanding of human nature, human duties, and human rights; opinions which the wise and philanthropical are convinced must and will ultimately prevail, notwithstanding the temporary opposition of prejudice and fear, of arrogance and selfishness, of the cold-hearted and the hard-hearted, of the purse-proud and the birth-proud. On the subject of parliamentary reform, Mr. Roscoe had an opportunity of laying his sentiments before the public, in a letter addressed to Mr. now Lord Chancellor Brougham, in the year 1811. This letter was called forth by one from Mr. Brougham, in which that gentleman had explained his own views, and requested those of his correspondent. Although there was not an exact harmony between the opinions of the writers, Mr. Brougham at that time believing that reform should be introduced, or rather insinuated, by slow degrees and small beginnings; yet he thought so highly of the general argument of Mr. Roscoe's letter, that he urgently requested him to publish it, and with this request its author complied. The main point enforced in the letter, with regard to the elective franchise, was, that "the right of voting should be extended to all who, as householders, are heads of families, and contribute to the exigencies of the state, as well as to some other descriptions of the community." The advocates for small and cautious reforms, are told plainly, that "the time for intermediate measures is past. Those who are in the possession of the

emoluments of office, and rely upon borough influence, have taken their stand; they will either retain all or lose all; and would consider the smallest concession towards reform as a Hollander would the cutting through an embankment, which would soon let in the ocean that must sweep him away." And to the same purpose is the following picturesque passage.

" 'He who attempts to restore a mouldering brick, or to replace a rotten timber, is as obnoxious to them, as he who would pull down the building. It is in the holes, and chinks, and corners, which time and decay have produced, that they live, and feed, and fatten; and the first symptom of improvement is to them the signal of alarm.' "— Vol. II. p. 9.

On the success of these opinions, let us now hear the biographer.

" At the close of his life Mr. Roscoe had the happiness of seeing a scheme of reform introduced, founded upon the principles which he had himself thus earnestly supported. He witnessed an attempt made to abolish 'the various and capricious qualifications' of voters, and to substitute, in place of them, a franchise at once just, simple, and rational, in those 'who as householders are heads of families, and contribute to the exigencies of the state.' He saw a system proposed which realized, in almost every particular, the plan recommended by himself. He did not, indeed, live to see the completion of this great measure, or to witness the confirmation which it afforded of the many important truths contained in his Letter to Mr. Brougham: to mark the accuracy of his assertion that 'the feeling of the people, when once warmed and excited, will not stop short of an ultimate and substantial reform,' and that 'alterations or reforms in government are more to be dreaded from the opposition they meet with, than from the effects they are likely to produce.' It was the happy fortune of his distinguished correspondent, not only to see these important changes effected, but also to be one of the principal instruments of their accomplishment." — pp. 12, 13.

The year following the publication of the above mentioned letter, Mr. Roscoe was strongly solicited by his Liverpool friends, to offer himself once more to represent his native city; and he was also requested to stand for Westminster. But he had made up his mind not to quit private life; and he probably wanted those showy and pushing qualities in action, which are almost necessary in political life, to gain for a man a con-

spicuous place, or a shining name. He exerted himself, however, as the head of the liberal party in Liverpool, to procure for his friends the best candidates, and Mr. Brougham and Mr. Creevey were prevailed upon to offer themselves. On this occasion Mr. Brougham paid a welcome visit to Allerton Hall. The anti-reformers were roused to exert themselves, and procured Mr. Canning as their candidate. After a sharp contest they carried the day, and Mr. Canning and General Gascoyne were returned.

From 1812 to 1815, Mr. Roscoe occupied himself chiefly with literary pursuits. During this period he became acquainted with Mr. Owen of Lanark; and his correspondence with him shows, that though he regarded some of his benevolent plans with approbation and pleasure, he seriously expostulated with him on those crazy and pernicious notions, which have completely vitiated all the good which that misguided individual has ever done, or probably can ever do. In 1814 he paid a long wished for visit, and one to which he had been long urged, to Holkam, and made a firm friend of its distinguished owner, Mr. Coke. Sir James Edward Smith, Dr. Parr, and others, had been invited to meet him; and here, among congenial companions, and in the midst of literary treasures, he passed several happy weeks. In Mr. Coke's library he found a large number of invaluable manuscripts and scarce books, and as they were in a most neglected condition, he offered to superintend their binding and repairs, on his return to Liverpool. The offer was accepted with gratitude, and the work was done in a masterly manner by Jones of Liverpool, who was quite a genius in his line of art. The visit to Holkam was repaid by Mr. Coke in the autumn of 1815.

We now come to the period when the strength of Mr. Roscoe's mind, and the depth and value of its resources, were doomed to be tried by a total reverse of worldly fortune; when the elegant competence, if not wealth, which he had acquired by professional labor, by his literary works, and by honorable business, was to be all taken away; when the choice collections which his taste had gathered, under the warrant of his means, were to be surrendered, divided, and scattered abroad.

Toward the close of the year 1815, the banking-house in which Mr. Roscoe was a partner, had labored under considerable difficulty, owing to several adverse circumstances.

In addition to this, the opening of the American trade, in consequence of the peace, created a great demand for cash, and large balances were withdrawn from the bank. After struggling for a few days to sustain themselves, the partners were obliged to suspend their payments, on the 25th of January, 1816. At a meeting of creditors, a committee of seven was appointed to inquire into the concerns of the house, and their report declaring the house to be solvent, was adopted at another meeting. Under this aspect of affairs, Mr. Roscoe believed himself justified in retaining the management of the business, and drew up a plan by which he proposed to discharge all the debts of the bank, with interest, in six years. To this end he labored with all his energies, early and late, and large payments were made; but owing to the fall of landed and other property, and various circumstances of a like unpropitious nature, he was at last obliged to relinquish what he had undertaken. The private property of the partners was surrendered at the first. Mr. Roscoe promptly yielded his own to the necessity of the case, and it was only parting with his library and literary collections, that cost him much regret. But he resolved to part with every volume and every print, excepting those only, which had been presented to him by their authors; and, in the midst of his engagements and anxieties he prepared the catalogue of his library with his own hands. The sale took place in 1817, and was attended by the principal collectors in the kingdom. Many of the rare volumes brought high prices. One manuscript alone, of the Bible, written about the fourteenth century, was sold for two hundred guineas, and was bought for Mr. Coke. The collection of prints produced nearly two thousand pounds, and that of drawings and paintings nearly three thousand more.

Mr. Roscoe's benevolence and deep sense of duty were brightly manifested in the midst of this dark change of condition. During the four years in which he was struggling to maintain the credit of his bank, and living with the most careful economy, he continued to correspond with his friends and with eminent men at home and abroad, on the subjects which interested his heart. In the year 1819, particularly, he exerted himself in many ways to soften the horrors of prisons and of the Criminal law of England, and published his three parts of "*Observations on Penal Jurisprudence*

and the Reformation of Offenders"; tracts which are informed by the spirit of enlightened humanity, and which, as we have before observed, contributed to bring about that system of prison discipline, which has already produced the most salutary effects in our own country.

As the difficulty of adjusting the affairs of the bank continued to increase, a few of Mr. Roscoe's creditors instituted suits against him, which obliged him to keep himself a prisoner in his own house, that he might not be taken to a less pleasant place of confinement; and a commission of bankruptcy having issued, all the partners in the concern were declared bankrupts. The suits against Mr. Roscoe, however, were still maintained, till at last he was freed from them, and restored to his entire liberty, by the allowance of his certificate of conformity, which had for some time been disputed. This was in the year 1820.

"It was at this period that, unknown to himself, several of his friends united together for the purpose of raising a sum of money for his use. This object was accomplished with ease, and the sum of 2500*l.* was contributed, and vested in trustees for the benefit of himself and his family. The office of communicating to him this kind and liberal act, on the part of his friends, was confided to Dr. Traill, who by his judicious representations, and affectionate remonstrances, succeeded in removing from the mind of Mr. Roscoe the objections which he felt to incur obligations of so serious a nature." — pp. 193, 194.

In the spring of the following year, the writer of this article, who was then in Liverpool, had the happiness of being made acquainted with Mr. Roscoe, and remembers well the impression of the first interview. His appearance was strikingly venerable, and at the same time most engaging. He was tall and well made, and when young must have been handsome. Now, his form was slightly bent, showing that years and sorrows were upon him, and that he felt their weight. His forehead was high, though not broad. His eyes were grey, full, and beaming with an expression at once lively and gentle. The brows which shaded them were thick and overhanging. His nose was elevated, narrow, and Roman. In his manners he was the perfect gentleman, — dignified and easy, though simple, affable, and unpretending. His voice was clear and pleasant, but his pronunciation was not entirely free from the peculiarities of the Lancashire

dialect, so that it was remarked for its provincialism when he was in parliament. This circumstance, however, by no means diminished the interest of his conversation, which was animated and flowing; and the ear soon became accustomed to what was at most but a slight defect, and forgot to notice it. He was no longer the wealthy banker; and the change of his circumstances was accompanied by a corresponding change in his style of living. He was no longer master of Allerton Hall, of its old pictures, its choice library, its noble park, and its garden of exotics. The fair mansion had passed into the hands of another proprietor, and its ornaments and delights had been brought to the hammer, and dispersed through the island. He was now living in one of a block of small houses which stand on what is called the Mount, a public walk in Liverpool, running parallel with Great George Street, and commanding an extensive view of the city, the river with its shipping, the Irish Channel on the right, and, a little to the left, the varied outline of the Welsh mountains. The appearance of things in the little parlour, indicated confined means, but still no want of the necessities, comforts, and some of the simpler elegancies of life. The furniture was plain, and just sufficient for every day's use; but near the fire-place there was a hanging-shelf of handsome books, a piano-forte occupied nearly one side of the room, and close to it in the corner stood a harp. Here dwelt the most distinguished man in Liverpool, and doubtless one of the happiest too, — happy in an interesting and virtuous family, in a self-approving conscience, in an unblemished and exalted reputation, and an established fame, — happy in the possession of riches, of which no changes in the mercantile world could deprive him, — far happier in the total loss of outward wealth, than many are in its full enjoyment and constant accumulation.

No longer occupied by the cares of business, Mr. Roscoe devoted the remnant of his years and energies to literary undertakings. In the course of the year 1821 he published his "*Illustrations, Historical and Critical, of the Life of Lorenzo de' Medici, called the Magnificent,*" which was intended to vindicate the character of his favorite, and his own fidelity and accuracy as his biographer; and, nearly at the same time, he produced a little volume entitled a "*Memoir of Richard Roberts Jones, of Aberdaron, in the county of Car-*

narvon, in North Wales, exhibiting a remarkable instance of a partial power and cultivation of intellect." This person was one of those singular individuals of our race who sometimes appear among us, exciting our wonder by great intellectual capacity of a certain sort, and an almost idiotic deficiency in every thing beside. He was first introduced to Mr. Roscoe's notice in 1806, and in a letter to Dr. Parr he thus describes him.

" 'Your letter found me in conversation with one of the most extraordinary beings that ever occurred to my notice—a poor Welsh fisher lad, as ragged as a colt, and as uncouth as any being that has a semblance of humanity. But beneath such an exterior is a mind cultivated not only beyond all reasonable expectation, but beyond all probable conception. In his fishing-boat on the coast of Wales, at an age little more than twenty, he has acquired the Greek, the Hebrew, and the Latin languages, has read the *Iliad*, *Hesiod*, *Theocritus*, &c., studied the refinements of Greek pronunciation, and examined the connexion of that language with the Hebrew. He reads Latin with the utmost facility, and translates it either into Welsh or English. I asked him whether he knew Italian? Yes, he could read it. I spoke to him in French,—he answered me, and we carried on our conversation in that language.

" 'He is well disposed, modest, truly pious, and intelligent, but in his exterior motions is certainly like no other creature on earth. He has just entered the room with a wallet of books in all languages, and on my speaking to him, he saluted me with a sort of curtsy, instead of a bow. Yet, the expression of his features speaks his mind; and if shaved and docked, he might not perhaps appear so frightful as at present.' "—pp. 215, 216.

Mr. Roscoe took this learned and forlorn being under his protection, but though he was never disappointed in his moral character, he never could teach him to apply his head or his hands to any thing useful, for that seemed to be totally beyond poor Richard's sphere. That his learning was really profound, appears from the following amusing anecdote of a conversation which he had with Dr. Parr, while the latter was on a visit to Allerton, in 1815.

"It was on a previous day, during the same visit, that Richard had an interview with Dr. Parr, who immediately plunged into the darkest recesses of ancient learning. The refinements of the Greek language, and the works of the critics who had illustrated it were entered into, and gradually the conversation

changed to the Hebrew, its peculiar construction and its analogous tongues. Here Richard had evidently the advantage; and, after an attempted inroad into the Chaldee, the Doctor rather precipitately retreated, leaving a token of his liberality in the hands of the poor scholar. Richard being afterwards asked what he thought of the learned person with whom he had been conversing, replied, 'He is less ignorant than most men.' " — pp. 219, 220.

Well said, honest Richard. Thy conscience would not permit thee to call the Doctor a great scholar or a learned man, for he was no match for thee in the old Hebrew and Chaldee tongues; — nevertheless, he did know something of the mysteries of Grecian prosody, and therefore thou didst candidly allow that he was "less ignorant than most men."

During the spring and summer of 1823, Mr. Roscoe was engaged in preparing a new edition of the works of Pope. In the same year he was chosen President of a Society which some gentlemen of Liverpool had formed for promoting the abolition of slavery, and drew up for them a Declaration of the objects of the Society, which was printed. In September, 1824, he lost his wife, with whom he had lived "upwards of forty years in uninterrupted confidence and harmony," and the shock was so great, that for a space of time his studies were laid aside.

In 1825, the edition of Pope's Works, with a new Life, appeared; and the editor had the manliness, — some might say the prudery, but we say the manliness and the high principle, — to omit some indelicate pieces which had been included in former editions. His views on this subject are thus stated.

" 'In performing the difficult task which has devolved upon the present editor, of determining what pieces ought to be admitted into this edition, as constituting "The Works of Pope," he has endeavoured to keep in view what he conceives to be the chief duty of an editor, viz. to execute an office which the author can no longer perform for himself, in the same manner as he would have performed it if living; admitting nothing that he would himself have rejected,* and rejecting nothing that he

* Pope himself acted upon this principle with regard to his friend Gay. 'Our poor friend's papers are in my hands; and for as much as is so, I will take care to suppress things unworthy of him.' — *Life of Pope*, p. 368."

would have admitted ; not, however, disregarding the additional considerations suggested by the change which has taken place (so greatly for the better) in the sentiments and manners of the present times, and by which, it is probable that the author himself would have been equally influenced. On the whole, he has reason to believe that the differences which would have arisen between the author and himself on this head, would have been trivial, if any ; and that the great variation in this respect will appear between the two last editions of Dr. Warton and Mr. Bowles and the present.' " — pp. 258, 259.

About a year afterwards, Mr. Roscoe published new editions of "*Lorenzo*" and "*Leo X.*" in which he availed himself of the valuable notes which had been appended to those works by their foreign translators. And now he felt that his life must be drawing near to its close, and he resolved, like a wise man, to engage in nothing new, but to complete those undertakings which were yet unfinished. These were, a manuscript catalogue of Mr. Coke's library at Holkam, his correspondence with Americans on the subject of penitentiaries, and a work on the Monandrian Plants, which was issued in numbers, and which had already gained for him a high botanical reputation. His labors were interrupted, toward the close of the year 1827, by an attack of paralysis, a tendency to which had existed for a long time before. From this he gradually recovered, however, and lived to enjoy a few years more of domestic happiness, and to see his wishes as an author all fulfilled.

The fifteenth and last number of the splendid work on Monandrian Plants was printed in 1830, and the volume, being the closing labor of its author's powers, and treating of perhaps the most charming department of natural history, was fitly inscribed, not to any earthly friend, but to his and nature's God.

" ' God of the changeful year ! — amidst the glow
Of strength and beauty, and transcendent grace,
Which, on the mountain heights, or deep below,
In sheltered vales, and each sequestered place,
Thy forms of vegetable life assume,
— Whether thy pines, with giant arms display'd,
Brave the cold north, or, wrapt in eastern gloom,
Thy trackless forests sweep, a world of shade ;
Or whether, scenting ocean's heaving breast,
Thy odoriferous isles innumerable rise ;

Or, under various lighter forms imprest,
Of fruits, and flowers, thy works delight our eyes;
God of all life! whate'er those forms may be,
O! may they all unite in praising Thee! " "

— pp. 301, 302.

There is nothing in the above lines to remind us, that nearly eighty years had passed over the writer's head, and that he had suffered from a disorder, which, above all others, is wont to impair the intellectual capacity.

"Mr. Roscoe," says his biographer, "might now almost be said to be *ultimus suorum*. He had survived not only the companions of his youth, but most of the friends of his maturer years." Holden and Rigby, Currie and Clarke, had long since been gone. Rathbone, Parr, Aikin, Fuseli, and more lately Sir J. E. Smith had followed them. He himself did not sit waiting long, after the departure of the last named friend. We should wrong our readers, were we to give an account of the last days and last moments of him whom we may call *our* friend, in any other words than those of his son.

"During the spring of the year 1831, there was little alteration in Mr. Roscoe's health, though it was obvious that he was becoming more and more feeble, and that any fresh attack of illness must prove eminently dangerous. He still continued to enjoy the society of his family, and of the friends who occasionally visited him; and when the weather permitted, he sometimes walked for a few minutes in his small garden, where he watched, with much pleasure, the progress of his few favorite flowers. He was fully sensible how very frail the tenure of his life had become; and as he stood, a short time before his last attack of illness, admiring the beauty of a border of white lilies, he remarked that, perishable as they were, they would probably survive him. But no feeling of dejection was mingled with these thoughts. A few weeks before his death, in a conversation with his friend and physician, Dr. Traill, he spoke calmly of his increasing feebleness and probable early dissolution. 'He thanked the Almighty for having permitted him to pass a life of much happiness, which, though somewhat checkered by vicissitude, has been, on the whole, one of great enjoyment; and he trusted that he should be enabled cheerfully to resign it whenever it pleased God to call him.' "

"In this tranquil and happy frame of mind he continued to

"* Dr. Traill's Memoir."

the last. Towards the conclusion of the month of June he suffered from a severe attack of the prevailing influenza, from which he appeared to have partially recovered, when, on the evening of Monday the 27th of June, while listening to a letter which one of his sons was reading to him, containing an account of the progress of the Reform Bill, he was suddenly seized with a violent fit of shivering, accompanied by an almost total prostration of strength. He was, with difficulty, conveyed to his bed, from which he never again rose. At this trying hour, that confidence in the goodness of God, and that submission to His will, which had supported him in every vicissitude of his life, did not desert him, and he resigned himself, without one murmur, to the change which he well knew was near at hand. While yet able, with difficulty, to make himself understood, he said to Dr. Traill, — ‘Some people suffer much in dying; I do not suffer.’ On the morning of Wednesday he indistinctly inquired from his highly valuable medical attendant, Mr. Bickersteth, his opinion with regard to his situation; and, on receiving his reply, he took leave of him with affectionate composure, by extending to him his hand. Soon afterwards he became unable, from weakness, to articulate, though he retained his senses till within an hour of his death, which took place at eleven o’clock, on Thursday morning, the 30th of June. The immediate cause of his death was an effusion of water into the chest.” — pp. 319, 320.

Thus passed away from earth one, who was not “of the earth, earthy”; one of those whom it does our souls good to remember, and still more good to imitate; one of those lovers of their brethren and lovers of God, whose lives we shall always take delight in recording, and whose names shine so purely above those which have only dazzled and deluded the world.

Mr. Roscoe left a family behind him, of six sons and two daughters. His literary tastes have descended to them all, and more than his poetical talents is the portion of his daughters. The following lines by one of them on her father’s seventieth birth-day, shall conclude our imperfect notice.

“Full seventy years, my father, on thy head
Have showered their aged honors; yet thy sun
Is bright and fresh as when it first begun,
And on the admiring world its influence shed.
O! long, and glad, and genial be its light,
And calm and blessed be its setting ray;
For thou hast in the labor of the day

Obey'd thy Master's call ; and in the right
Thy voice was ever heard, from youth's green prime :
And foremost was thy bosom in the strife,
For all the good that can ennoble life,
Against oppression, tyranny, and crime :
Yes ! freedom, virtue, and the good man's fame
Shall ever shed their light around thine honored name."
— pp. 357, 358.

[For the Christian Examiner.]

ART. II.—*Spirit of the Hebrew Scriptures.*—No. II.
Temptation, Sin, and Punishment.

WE closed our last article with some remarks upon the origin of evil, taking the subject in a metaphysical point of view. But what is more practically important, is the history of its origin as a matter of fact, in the individual souls in which it is manifested. For few men are capable of bringing metaphysical truths to bear upon their own lives ; or, in other words, few men are in such habits of mind, that general truths fructify in their thoughts, even though they do assent to them when presented as matters of opinion.

This was especially the case in the age of Moses ; and it is sufficiently so now for us to be able to appreciate the good sense and knowledge of human nature, which forms one of the claims of the Jewish lawgiver to being considered inspired ; for good sense, and knowledge of human nature, are the last products of the human mind, when developed in the natural way,—if we may believe the testimony of common experience.

But let us follow his own steps. When he wishes to bring home to the minds of his readers the fact, that moral evil was assumed upon the nature of man by his own acts, and subsequently to his being "created upright," he wisely selects the first sin of the first beings created ; not that it was the greatest, but that it was the simplest case of moral evil on historical record ; indeed the simplest case that could be imagined. As we reflect upon it, we shall see that it is peculiarly fortunate for the illustration of human frailties.

Each one of us may learn from it, by analogy, the history of his own individual fall. But in order to understand the temptation and the sin, we must inquire into the primitive condition of man, from our sole authority for this age.

Moses describes this condition by a beautiful sketch, or more properly, by a finished painting. "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil." (Then follows a geographical description.) "And the Lord God commanded the man saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

Some think that Moses meant to express, in a graphic manner, by this passage, that, besides plenty and beauty, which were poured around man, that his body might continue and grow, there was also given a means for his soul's expansion and growth;—the tree of life perhaps designating extraordinary effusions of God's spirit, (and that by an oriental mind this would be easily understood): while temptation in general is expressed in the figure of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; especially, perhaps, the temptations to the indulgence of the lower appetites.

But perhaps a more literal interpretation would be quite as philosophical.

Supposing that man was called upon to deny himself the pleasure of eating of a tree, which was very desirable in appearance, is there not an apparent adaptation to the circumstances in the institution of such a sacrifice? Though a man in reason (as is implied in God's having given him a command), yet he must have been an infant in understanding,*—thoughtless,—inexperienced,—weak in moral power. And was not this sacrifice adapted to such a being? Was it not in the direct line of those thoughts and feelings, which must necessarily have constituted a large portion of his consciousness; viz. the bliss of new found existence,—the en-

* *Reason and understanding* are used here according to their old meanings, i. e. in the same sense in which Coleridge uses them.

joyment of his appetites? Since the soul unfolds its powers by being exercised in reflection on the designs of its existence, and the purposes of God respecting it, was it not peculiarly fit, that what was to call him to reflection and internal effort, should be placed in the midst of what interested him as a physical being? The tree might have been a very common one, one that he could not avoid continually seeing: that it was the most beautiful and desirable, might serve to teach him, that the principle, for the sake of which he sacrificed, was infinitely beyond the most beautiful thing of material creation in value. Thus, the not eating of the fruit would excite and assist the spirit within, reminding it of God's interest in individual man, — and serving all those purposes, which outward worship is intended to serve in all ages of the world.

We cannot say of the command "not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil," as we did of the command "to have dominion," — that it is the germ of all religion. On the contrary, it is a specific direction, the design of which was, to assist the divine instinct of self-respect, which is the universal revelation; and, as such, it is a proof of divine wisdom. If man were a purely spiritual being, natural religion, i. e. the laws of his nature, recognised by reason and the heart, might have sufficed him. But his life is not a mere consciousness of first principles. He is operated upon by the external, and himself reacts; and religion must address him with some other voice than the deep one in the soul. Hence the blessing of specific duties, — something *to do*, which may enlist his animal nature and active powers, in alliance with the inward sentiment for the same end. The value of the prohibition to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, consists in its adaptation to the existing state of circumstances. Suppose Adam had obeyed this command, and afterwards had been placed in new circumstances. His own judgment, or perhaps more specific directions of God, would still have imposed on him other sacrifices and other self-denial, until his soul was sufficiently elevated for the fruition of heaven.

It is important to learn, however, to make the distinction between general principles and specific directions. Not making the distinction has led to superstition and bigotry; and, moreover, has made the commandment of God of no effect

on thousands, by whom general truth was professedly revered. These specific directions are not of universal obligation; but they are not to be undervalued. The wisest are not all the time elevated into the sphere of general truth. A voice must come from the earth beneath, warning man not to grovel upon it, which may be heard when the head is drooping, and the sun of the intellectual firmament obscured by the shadow of our own recumbent body. For want of these specific directions, addressing the active nature of man, the sublime speculations of the wise have generally failed of practical effect, even on those few who have admitted them; and they have entirely soared over, without touching, the minds of the multitude. Moses has united the two modes of developement. The more deeply men have reflected on their nature, the more have the wisest learned to feel, that man must *act* in order to be pure in heart,—that to do good is the road to goodness. Even a consciousness of connexion with the Creator has been in vain to those, who have not equally cultivated a sense of connexion with their fellow beings. The things of time act, as well as are acted upon;—the balance of action and reaction must be kept up. Man must not only contemplate the Deity, but must coöperate in his ceaseless action, sacrificing lower enjoyments whenever they interfere, if he would be a son of God. If this be true, how wise was Moses, who, before there had been experience of the effects of various systems, yet so simply and unassumingly stated the true method of cultivation! And the form in which he does it is also remarkable.

The temptation, the fall, the sense of condemnation, are all represented, in the living colors of poetry, a dramatic scene. These colors and this scene have given rise to various explanations, and some have been more subtle than the case demanded. Moses was indeed expressing intellectual and moral truth by pictures, but it is not necessary to suppose that he used allegory. His object was not to disguise truth, but to give it a medium, which should attract the attention by waking up the imagination. It may be that facts were the materials, out of which he formed his picture. A serpent may have eaten of the apple. Its characteristic subtlety might have struck the mind of Eve, as connected with this food. Dwelling upon the subject is aptly enough described as parleying with the tempter. The first yielding of

the good principle, though only so far as to question the expediency of obeying the divine direction, gives the lower propensities too much sway ;—they conquer ;—retribution commences, — more keenly felt, perhaps, because contrasted with the previous innocence ;—and Paradise is lost.

The fact stated as the immediate cause of Adam's sin, is so simple and natural, that it could receive no liveliness from poetry. "And she gave also to her husband with her, and he did eat." He might have sympathized in all that went before ; or, if he did not, we may see the effect of the mere example of the loved upon the unprepared heart.

Moses was certainly not writing to a people skeptical from philosophical speculation, but only skeptical, if they ever were so, from stupidity and sensuality ; therefore it would be strange if his narrative were guarded against philosophical doubts. But, keeping this in mind, let us proceed to consider the subject philosophically, and we shall find, that for poetry, it bears a remarkable scrutiny, such a scrutiny, that we may be led to feel it has solid truth for its foundation.

Do any make objection to this account of the introduction of evil into the world ? Do they say that it implicates the Deity, and supposes that he places stumblingblocks at the very threshold of existence ?

But it was not the very threshold of existence. The command was known before the temptation occurred. The man was told that his spirit was the object of God's love, and that temptation was to come to his animal nature.

When he saw this tree, and especially the serpent eating of it, what would be the state of his mind ? On the one hand, appetite would excite the emotion of desire ; on the other, conscience would set the divine command ; and the balance, you will say, is equal. Not at all so. There has been a preparation of mind before, and according to what this has been, will the event now be. Has he, then, endeavoured to strengthen his spiritual nature ? Has he meditated on his origin ? Has he often recalled the truth, that he was created sovereign over all things which he saw, and increased the intuition of self-respect into a habit of mind ? Has he lifted his heart to the Creator of spirits, and thanked him fervently for spiritual existence, and increased the emotion of gratitude into the sentiment of devotion ? Has he employed his intellect in detecting the designs of the Deity, and the attributes

impressed on the exterior of the material creation, so that every object has become to his eye a minister of religion?

Or has he allowed the command of God to pass away from his recollection; has he indolently enjoyed his animal being, without inquiring into the source of enjoyment, or the mysteries of his own spirit; has he allowed the emotion of gratitude to slumber, a latent spark; and not used his intellect to seek for the designs of the Creator in nature?

If the latter is the case, then there is no hope; for time has gone on, and if he has not employed it in fortifying his mind, it has employed itself in strengthening the animal propensities. The soul increases by exercise; and unless it will exercise itself and bring around itself the spiritual world, which is its sustaining energy, — its vivifying atmosphere, — the earthly and worldly part of us gains the mastery; for the earth and world are around us in spite of ourselves, and will do their work, unless they are resisted.

“Earth fills her lap with pleasures of her own;
The homely nurse does all she can
To make her foster-child, her inmate, man
Forget the glories he has known,
And that imperial palace whence he came.”

The revelation of his nature, if it had been attended to, would, by producing self-respect, or reverence for his soul, have prevented his remaining in temptation. A strong feeling of gratitude, growing from the habit of worshipping in spirit, would have quickened him to reply to the tempter. “No; all that I know of God is goodness, tenderness. He is too great to fear a rival; and, besides, I cannot but believe, that his prohibitions are the result of kindness, since every thing that I do know, without exception, evinces it in a boundless degree.” A habit of thoughtfulness, also, would have disarmed the temptation of its powers; — for it did not require reasoning faculties beyond those of an intelligent child, to see, in this command, God’s purpose of strengthening the soul’s power “to have dominion,” by giving it a field of exercise.

By the help of this preparation, for which he must have had time, he could have resisted. And resistance would have carried his whole soul a step forward in its progress, and the temptation would have become the means of his progress and not of his fall; — the stumblingblock would

have been the steppingstone. And when his mind was raised, we cannot doubt, God would have poured into it new light. We cannot suppose he meant to keep man ignorant. He would develop the religious principle before he would put into his hands the instrument of knowledge, by which he might wound himself and others. The *tree of life* may be a figurative expression for the means of communicating this new light. Had man resisted the temptation, his eyes might have opened to these means, and he have become fitted for a new mode of existence, — and, like Enoch and Elijah, have been raised to the enjoyment of it, without passing through the dark valley of the shadow of death. Or, according to a more literal interpretation, the tree of life might have been a real tree, the fruit of which was to make a gradual change in the physical organization, until man became an inhabitant of a celestial body, and consequently unconfined to the narrow bounds of earth, which is to pass away, “like a scroll that is rolled together.” The precise interpretation is of little consequence, — the general inference from either interpretation is the same.

Adam’s overt act of disobedience to the specific command of God was merely a manifestation to himself and others, of the state of his character. It proved that he had not obeyed the divine instinct of preserving dominion over transitory things. It proved that he had been thoughtless, that he had not availed himself of the privilege of communion with God in prayer, that he was ungrateful, and consequently that he was weak.

If this lesson can be drawn from the history of the fall of the first man, what a proof it is of the wisdom of Moses! How much superior to any theory of the origin of evil which has been proposed in subsequent ages, were these simple facts! The inference from these facts, who may not see? These circumstances could hardly occur again in the history of the race, but analogous circumstances must occur in the history of every individual. Whatever is inferred from it, then, is general truth.

Let us apply this general truth to the circumstances of the present age.

Is not the child committed to our care, really in Eden? Does not “the sunshine of the breast,” “the tear forget as soon as shed,” constitute Eden. And does not the advance

into intelligence reveal the command "to have dominion"? Who that has ever observed a child, has not witnessed it?

But the child is below Adam in one privilege. The sense of power is not accompanied, in the child, with an intellectual consciousness of its author. There is, however, a thirst connected with his sense of power, for which it is the business of education to provide the waters of life, — the knowledge of God. Let him be taught the existence of God, his Creator, whose spiritual nature he may be led to understand by the analogy of his own mind and heart; let him be told, that his destiny is to resemble that Creator even in the high prerogative of power. There are means of inducting these truths into young minds, and the information will find a response within. It would be well afterwards, but not at first, to call the attention to external objects, as exponents of the Creator's attributes, and to help the child to form those associations, which will make matter and circumstance stepping-stones to heaven. Such a course would have strengthened Adam; — we may be allowed to doubt whether he pursued it.

It should be remembered, also, that it is important to call the attention, at first, to religious views of external objects, much more than to any other views. We find God would develop the religious principle before he provided means for the acquisition of natural knowledge. Let this principle never be lost sight of in education, — to keep moral objects above all other objects of the mind. A real reception of moral truth is the only security against the abuse of all other truths.

And since man is ever an active being, we must come to specific directions as to what he must do. In the multitude of these, what are to be selected for the child?

If he is yet innocent, or not far from innocence, point out to him in the garden of his life the forbidden fruit. Explain to him what he must not do; his sacrifices will be small, — the not eating of an apple; — but point out to him that these restraints are imposed, lest he should lose or harden his conscience by not thinking of it, and you will give these little sacrifices importance in his eyes. Show him, too, that the design of God in giving him duties, is not to throw a stumblingblock in his way, but to enable him to prepare his mind beforehand with the strength to resist temptation and grasp spiritual good. If the truth, that *the effectual resistance to*

temptation is not so much the result of the struggle of the moment, as of the preparation of the past, be made a persuasion of his mind, it will be of infinite service to him. If he is made to understand, that "to the pure all things are pure," he will see the utility of the habit of thinking of God, and multiplying religious associations, amidst the works of nature, and the pleasures as well as the sorrows of life.

Specific directions must vary according to circumstances ; but the principle on which they are founded is never to be lost sight of. When the child is far from the state of innocence, common sense will suffice, with the aid of light from the examples in revelation, to form specific rules by which to bring him back to a state of innocence, i. e. to a vivid and powerful state of conscience ; for what is powerful conscience but the recollections of innocence ?

A few remarks must be made upon the circumstance that Eve is named as the immediate tempter of Adam. Was this to imply the power of the example of the familiar, and especially of the loved ?

Whether Moses meant to speak of this influence or not, there is no doubt a great influence, an unmeasured influence, exerted by example. And if this power of one over another is a stumblingblock to virtue, may not a consciousness of this power, on the other hand, become a sense of responsibility, most elevating in its influence ?

The influence of example may be estimated when we consider, not merely a national character, which has so many causes that the effect of one can hardly be defined, — but if we consider family character, sectarian character, or any character produced by association. A great deal of good, undoubtedly, springs from our susceptibility to this influence. But it is an influence below the spirit of God. We should always, therefore, question it by the light of that spirit. Adam should have done so ; — had he done so, perhaps he would not have fallen.

If then we may confide in Moses, as displaying the principles upon which Providence governs the world, and if it is not unreasonable to think it wise to apply the same principles to the successive stages of individual character, which were applied to the successive stages of the development of the race, we may derive from this narrative, that the first principle of cultivation is *to reverence the soul, by*

and through a sense of its Creator ; and that the true method of discipline is, to put the soul into a state of progress, by making it act on the view of preparing to resist temptation ; — while pure example, as a moral atmosphere, is most desirable. These are great truths, speculative and practical ; has time developed any which have superseded them ?

But let us go on with Moses. Having painted Creation and moral obligation in general, the specific command of God, and temptation and sin, he proceeds to paint retribution ; and, truly metaphysical as the whole lesson is, he was laid under a necessity, by the divine wisdom with which he was inspired, to paint it. Therefore the internal sense of self-reproach, and the discord which sin makes in the “music of the spheres,” are all put into a dialogue ; and otherwise Moses would not have met the mind of the age for which he was writing.

And what are the words of condemnation, which he has put into the mouth of God ? A statement of facts, which must have been as true before the temptation and fall, as they were afterwards. The serpent was to creep on his belly, and eat dust ; mankind to depend physically on each other, and contend with obstacles ; — and the dust of the body was to mingle again with the dust from which it was taken.

Where then was the condemnation ? Was it not this ; — that man, through abuse of his freedom, was changed, so that what was Paradise to him once, became without change of circumstances, “a working-day world” ? There are some arguments for this. In the first place, from our own experience ; — though we are not born into Paradise, who has not felt, that, from each of us, “there hath passed away a glory from the earth,” which is never restored but in those bright moments, when, in the spirit of Christian faith, we see the “New Jerusalem descending out of heaven” ?

But to go to the narrative, and to reason from thence exclusively. Moses was writing for a people, who felt evils and sufferings to be so mixed with the advantages of the social state, as often to neutralize them all ; who felt difficulty to be inevitable ; and who said “Dust returns to dust,” — and looked no farther. This was always one aspect even of Paradise, the aspect to the eye of sense ; and when the eye of sense became paramount, the celestial aspect of Par-

adise was lost on the earth. Moses represented all this by stating things as they were actually existing in his days, and leaving the lesson to be enforced by the associations with which all earthly things were clothed to human eyes and the human heart. The whole effect of his narrative was, to carry imagination back to the period, before the abuse of man's free agency had introduced unharmonized affections into the social relations,—indolence and want of spring into the soul, which was viewing the necessity of exertion,—and the sting unto death. The narrative would tell more or less painfully on the heart, as the individual hearer's own weakness or sense of sin gave meaning to the words. In showing that the evils of human life were foreign to human nature,—in expressing, that they were evils relatively to the conception of the weak or sinful only, by having drawn mankind innocent, and called his condition Paradise,—he gave a stimulus to the recovery of that “glorious heritage, which, though lost, may be won, and with interest.”

Let us now examine the previous words of condemnation, and see if we have reason to think they meant change of circumstances. In the first place the serpent is condemned. But here we cannot suppose was change of circumstances. He is represented to be confined to a particular sphere; to which, however, we know that he was confined before; and the race of man is said to be above him in destiny, and so we know it was before. Besides, could there have been a moral retribution for the serpent? Was the fruit forbidden to him? Or was he responsible for the effect of his own appropriate actions upon the conduct of his lord and master, man? Had he, in short, any mind to feel retribution? The condemnation of the serpent is to be considered as an embellishment of the style,—a clause put in to complete the dramatic unity of the poem.

In the second place, mankind are condemned to depend physically on each other, and to suffer;—especially woman, who is most dependent, physically at least. But what reason have we for supposing that the social state was altered in its circumstances? Can we not feel, by a moment's reflection, that this same social state, supposing man was not weak or sinful, could not be better constituted for promoting the purest happiness, and a continually progressing virtue? Pain was introduced into the social state, when spiritual ac-

tivity ceased, and the harmony of innocence was lost ; since human beings, in such close contact as the social relations bring them into, must jar against each other's faults, if they have faults. There are other effects of sin upon the social state, which have grown either directly or indirectly out of it, and therefore may have been included in the "pain," which Moses describes as belonging to life after the fall. There is an effect produced in the physical organization of man, by want of moral regulation, which is felt through successive generations. This does not, however, produce unmingled evil. The variety of forbidden fruit which has thus been introduced into the garden of life, excites the intellectual powers of man ; and according as these are engaged against evil, is he raised in the scale of intelligence, which leads into moral life.

From this disadvantageous effect of the physical dependence of mankind on each other, it is possible our Saviour may have been exempted, in order to his being qualified for the unparalleled duty laid upon him. The circumstances of his birth were miraculous. Yet these circumstances seem hardly to be recognised in the Gospels, and are never referred to after they are first mentioned. This leads to the inference that the whole miracle was intended especially for Mary. And the effect on her mind, if it was intended, was admirably calculated to neutralize all other influences ever exerted on it, and through it, on the body of her child. And since it was the purpose of God to lay on him "the burden of the sins of the whole world," i. e. to give him the great work of redeeming the race, by the manifestation of his mind in word and action, it seems but just that he should have had the physical possibility of not passing through the slightest moral evil,—at least equal to Adam's possibility, who had certainly no hereditary bias to evil. The next portion of the words of condemnation expresses the painfulness of exertion to fallen man, "in the sweat of the brow," &c. It is so evident that exertion is only painful to the weak, that it is not necessary to dwell on the uncircumstantialness of this part of the condemnation.

Death is the closing portion of the words of condemnation. But even here the change was not circumstantial, else we have gained even by the fall ; for who would live on earth for ever ? The change was still within the soul. Death

becomes frightful as the eye of sense becomes paramount to the eye of faith. This part of the curse is represented very powerfully. A flaming sword and cherubim are placed between man and the tree of life. That the tree of life was not annihilated, Jesus has proved. He encountered the flaming sword and cherubim, and opened the way to the life-giving tree, to all his followers; — and thousands are eating of it every day, and “death is swallowed up in victory.”

Thus did Moses, in all the brilliant coloring of poetry and the liveliness of drama, express, that the sinfulness of man, (and that alone) has given a painful aspect to the circumstances of human life. He does not express, however, that men were reduced by sin to such a state, as to be no longer the objects of God’s interest; or, that it is anywhere hinted, that they had lost their power of growing in favor with him by doing his will and progressively more exactly; and, we would ask, when the books of Moses constituted the whole Scriptures, could it be said with any coloring of evidence, that the Scriptures taught the total and hereditary moral depravity of man? And, if they did not, can the doctrine be considered as a fundamental and eternal truth, “the same yesterday, to-day, and forever,” the acknowledgment of which is essential to the commencement of virtue, — *the first step* in the spiritual life?

But, although it be true that man could be turned out of Paradise without change of circumstances, is he now born into Paradise, and, if good, can he grow up in Paradise; and why not?

We answer, that the introduction of evil into the world, by giving a new aspect to the social state, and the moral and physical dependence of man on man, has affected the race, “as a race.” Even “the express image” of the perfection of God, inasmuch as he was a man, “was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.” We have spoken already of the complication of temptation, by the physical dependence of successive generations. Another way in which the introduction of evil has affected the race is this; — the moral influence exerted by our fellow creatures is not pure, and although the influence of Jesus, in the end, may more than balance all others, yet the influence of others gets the start, since it is exerted before the mind is advanced enough to receive his gospel, which is to neutralize the influence of others. This

moral influence of our fellow creatures is not, it is probable, strong enough, ever, to turn the scale of character, if an individual's own power is exerted; but it is strong enough to give still new varieties to the forbidden fruit. It is, however, to be observed, that as a mind is highly gifted, it is less influenced by this disadvantage of the social state. Nor should this be otherwise, since it has a greater responsibility. And it is more than probable that Jesus, whose powers of mind were as boundless as his responsibilities, was altogether, at every period of his life, beyond this disadvantage.

Some have supposed, that Adam transmitted a moral taint, strong enough to turn the scale. This is the common doctrine of original sin. But there is an objection to this, drawn from the nature of his mind. Every one is conscious that what constitutes his moral existence, is independent of every source but his Creator. His powers of thought and his emotions, as well as his will, and his conscience, are his own; he feels that they can be ascribed to no ancestry; that they are the immediate expressions of the goodness of his Creator towards himself, as an individual.

There is, besides the two abovementioned ways, still another, in which the introduction of evil into the social state has influenced, and must always influence the race, as a race, more or less. It has made the state of probation a state of suffering, if not by consciousness of evil, by sympathy with those who incur it. So much is our happiness bound up in one another, that though "the dayspring from on high has visited us," the very circumstance of sin's being in the world, has cast "the shadow of the valley of death" on us, and man cannot pass among his brethren, without feeling the night-chill of the atmosphere of moral evil. Heaven dawns upon us in Christianity; but the sun rises not into full view "till this mortal hath put on immortality." Even he who "was without sin" proved himself in this also of the race of Adam. He wept over Jerusalem; he "groaned in spirit and was troubled" at the want of faith of his disciples; he sweat "drops of blood" in his agony, when about to encounter the fury of the multitude for whose moral good he was ready to die; and, in view of the cross, he was constrained to pray, "Father, if thou wilt, let this cup pass from me."

The questions now arise, "How can the introduction of evil into the social state have affected the race, without in-

terfering with the free agency of individuals, and placing an unconquerable obstacle to each one's accomplishing his own destiny? How, in the progress of changes, has the balance been held even by God, so that the free will (i. e. personal activity) of man has alone had power to turn the scale?"

The answer is, that the mind of man has made progress in intellectual power, in the course of ages, according to that law of nature, by which as "one man dies, other men enter into the fruit of his labors,"—and that the complication of temptations excites intellectual exertions for moral power; warnings and experience have accumulated also, as evil influences have multiplied. And in these latter times (which will come in due time to be considered only as a different shade of that antiquity into which our conceptions throw Moses), a moral influence has been poured upon the race by God, through Jesus Christ, which will counterbalance all conceivable complication and accumulation of evil influences from the rest of our race. And this seems to have been foreseen by Moses, who states, that by the social relations, "the seed of the woman," shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.

The moral condition of man is therefore as much in his own power now, as it ever was in Adam's power; and he may, by using the means of grace, which have been granted to the wants of the fallen, raise himself to a higher state, than that in which Adam was created. There are, indeed, internal conflicts and temptations, which are utterly independent of all the circumstances we have noted, and which are different to each individual. These arise from the necessity of balancing our internal affections; and to this species of temptation Jesus was undoubtedly exposed in proportion to the immeasurable strength of those faculties and sensibilities, which raised him to his office, but which first grew into wisdom, and "into the favor of God," and "through suffering were trained into obedience."

We have now gone over the outlines of Moses' narrative. There are some fine touches of his pencil, full of meaning,—such as the excuses the parties are made to offer, the shame which they feel, &c.; but we cannot dwell upon every stroke of the master. We have found in this narrative an implied theory of the origin of moral evil, and the nature of retribution, which seems to us to be consistent with the

brighter light thrown upon the subject by Christianity. This is enough to prove its inspiration, to the mind of a reflecting person.

It is worth while to remark, however, that the history of Adam is not referred to again in the books of the Old Testament, and only for the sake of a figure, now and then, in the New,— though theologians have made so much of it in their books. And although we may derive from it, that sin has taken the character of Paradise from the mere circumstances of human life, yet we are not authorized to derive from it, that the race, or the earth, were absolutely cursed in themselves. Even the social state is still a blessing, and the evils that have been introduced into it, may become steppingstones to the highest virtue ; as they proved to *him* who looked upon them in the spirit of God, and acted on their great principle, i. e. on the design of God in instituting them, — loving unto death, and conquering the flaming sword in the very eye of sense, and opening to the believer the tree of life, where all may now go and take up the fruit and eat. Moreover, even without the light of Christianity, it is impossible for man in his sound mind to regret that he is a social being ; for all his happiness, nay, all his conceptions of happiness centre in the social principle.

Great general truths, however, though not the doctrine of reprobation, are contained in the Mosaic account of the curse. 1st. The nature of the mind is such, that *sin when realized, is painful, and sufficiently so to be its own remedy* ; and, 2dly, God has so ordered the conditions of social existence, that *retribution is felt from the very same circumstances, which are the best possible arrangements for the promotion of the happiness of the innocent and good*. Let us not lose sight of these truths in our own institutions and plans for the cultivation of the human soul ; and when we wish to anticipate the retributions of Heaven, let us do it by raising vivid conceptions of truth and goodness, through the recollections of innocence, the intuitions of conscience, a wide view of providence, and especially by the knowledge of Jesus Christ.

ART. III. — *Christologie des Alten Testaments, und Commentar über die Messianischen Weissagungen der Propheten.* Von E. W. HENGSTENBERG, &c.

Christology of the Old Testament, and Commentary upon the Prophecies relating to the Messiah. By Dr. E. W. HENGSTENBERG, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Vol. I. Berlin. 1829.

HENGSTENBERG has been brought into notice, in this country, by translations of several portions of the work before us, in the Andover "Repository." He is a young man, distinguished in Germany chiefly for his zealous endeavours to resuscitate the dry bones of Lutheran orthodoxy, and his strenuous exertions to secure the aid of the powers that be, in favor of the cause or party to which his labors are devoted. From his writings one would suppose, that he had at least sufficient confidence in the correctness and stability of his opinions. But such a supposition it is not very easy to reconcile with the zeal, with which he endeavours to persuade the government of his country, that the cause of legitimacy and the cause of orthodoxy are inseparably connected. *

For the notice, which has been taken of him in this country, he is, we think, indebted in part to his orthodoxy, and in part to the important and difficult subject, upon which he has undertaken to write. That he has some pretensions to scholarship, we do not pretend to deny. He has, no doubt, made a diligent use of great opportunities for the acquisition of ancient languages. But it is evident that he possesses but a feeble capacity of reasoning concerning the meaning of words, or the relations of things. He is deficient in logical discrimination, judgment, and good sense. To those, who are in the habit of distinguishing words from things, and of weighing arguments, rather than counting them, he will prove a most unsatisfactory writer. Paulus himself is not a more extravagant theorist, than he is in his way. Had the prevalent bias of his mind enlisted him on the side of the Naturalists, our knowledge of him, if we had any, would probably have been derived from the quotations

* For some notice of the school or sect, to which he belongs, see the Christian Examiner, New Series, Vol. V. p. 348, *et seq.*

from his works, of here and there a sentence with three or four notes of admiration at the end.

It will be gathered from what we have said, that it is the importance of the subject upon which he has written, rather than the value of his work, which has led to the present notice of him. His work will answer a valuable purpose, if it conduce to a thorough examination of a subject, which, since the theory of a double sense has been exploded, has caused perplexity and anxiety to many minds. It is entitled "The Christology of the Old Testament," that is, as the title is illustrated by the work, "The application and interpretation of the passages relating to the Messiah, in the Old Testament." He undertakes to show what are the predictions of a Messiah, what nature and character they ascribe to him, and how they have been fulfilled in Jesus. The genuineness and antiquity of various portions of the Hebrew Scriptures are also connected with the discussion.

It is not a little remarkable, that no work, professing to treat of the subject in a scientific manner, and in its whole extent, is to be found in the English language. What has been written upon it, has been chiefly in the way of controversy with unbelievers; and has had for its object, to repel their attacks upon the Christian revelation, rather than to give a comprehensive and thorough exposition of facts, in all their relations. Most of the English works on the subject belong to the controversy, which, about a century ago, agitated the reading community of England, commencing with Collins's *Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*. Perhaps it may not be amiss to glance at some of the principal points of this controversy, and to take notice of the theory of Hengstenberg, as it comes in our way.

It was the object of Collins to show, 1st, That the fundamental article of the Christian Religion is, that Jesus is the Messiah predicted in the Old Testament, and that the proof of Christianity was by our Saviour and the writers of the New Testament made to depend upon the fulfillment of prophecies relating to the Messiah; 2dly, That these prophecies were, and could be, applied to Jesus only in a mystical or allegorical sense, and thus did not prove any thing, according to scholastic rules,—by which he means the rules of sound logic, or the dictates of reason; 3dly, That the kind of

reasoning adopted by the New Testament writers, or the manner in which they apply passages of the Old Testament, as proofs of Christianity, is not only unsatisfactory and groundless, but affords a positive argument against the divine authority of the Christian religion. These are the principal points of the controversy, stated with greater directness than in Collins's work, but evidently maintained by him. Many important questions, however, were incidental to it.

It is not surprising, that such a work, written with ability, and made attractive to some readers by considerable powers of sarcasm and wit, should produce a strong sensation, and call forth a host of writers in defence of the Christian faith. In his second work, "The Scheme of Literal Prophecy Considered," written in reply to several of his antagonists, Collins enumerates no less than thirty-five publications, many of them octavos, occasioned by his "Discourse, &c." Several others were afterwards called forth by his second work, abovementioned. The principal writers in opposition to Collins, were Dr. Edward Chandler, Bishop of Litchfield, &c., in his "Defence of Christianity from the Prophecies of the Old Testament," and his "Vindication of the Defence, &c."; in reply to "The Scheme of Literal Prophecy Considered"; Dr. Samuel Chandler, in his "Vindication of the Christian Religion"; Dr. Bullock, in his Seven Sermons, entitled "The Reasoning of Christ and his Apostles in their Defence of Christianity, Considered"; Dr. Sykes, in his "Essay on the Truth of the Christian Religion," and "The True Grounds of the Expectation of the Messiah"; Dr. Clarke, in his Discourse of the connexion of the prophecies of the Old Testament, and the application of them to Christ; Dr. Thomas Sherlock, in "The Use and Intent of Prophecy in different Ages of the Church"; Mr. Jeffery, in "A Review of the Controversy between the Author of the Discourse and his Adversaries," and "Christianity the Perfection of all Religions, &c."; Whiston in his "Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies," and several other publications.

In this country, the controversy was revived about twenty years ago, by the publication of George B. English, "The Grounds of Christianity examined, by comparing the New Testament with the Old"; which called forth the work of

Mr. Everett, "A Defence of Christianity, against the Work of George B. English."

And what was the result of this controversy? Was the united talent of the English theologians sufficient to clear up the difficulties of the subject? That it was not, is evident from the great variety of inconsistent schemes, on which the replies to Collins were founded; from the fact, that the controversy has been repeated in Germany within the last fifty years; from the results of this controversy, and from the unsettled state of opinion upon the subject in this country. Still, the English writers convicted Collins of many errors, and illustrated some important points.

1. It was shown by Dr. Bullock and others, that the fundamental article of the Christian religion is, not that Jesus was the predicted Messiah, but that he was an inspired prophet, a teacher sent from God, speaking the words of God, to whom God gave his spirit without measure, and who proved by miracles, that his doctrines and precepts were worthy of all acceptance.*

There is, evidently, just ground for such a distinction. For, that Jesus was an inspired prophet, a teacher sent from God, is proved by miracles, in connexion with a doctrine worthy of the divine interposition to reveal. For the proof of this proposition, miracles addressed to the senses of the contemporaries of Jesus, and transmitted to us by contemporaneous history, are the best species of evidence we can imagine. The proof is complete, and would be so, though we knew nothing of such a book as the Old Testament. But in order to prove the proposition, that Jesus sustained a particular character, namely, that of a Messiah described and predicted in the Old Testament, it may be admitted that miracles are not suitable evidence. They are not evidence appropriate to the subject. In order to settle the question, whether the character and life of Jesus fulfilled particular predictions relating to a Messiah in the Hebrew Scriptures, the proper mode of proceeding evidently is, to compare this life and character with such predictions. Here seems to be no place for miracles, but only for common sense in the interpretation of the language of such predictions, and in comparing

* See Bullock's Seven Sermons, p. xix., *et seq.*

the character and fortunes of Jesus with the results of such interpretation. *Nec deus intersit, &c.* It is an unworthy supposition, that God should give certain predictions, as marks by which a certain future messenger of his will should be known, in language so obscure as to require an inspired person to interpret it. In such a case, prophecy would resolve itself into the testimony of the interpreter, as a new revelation. It would not be distinct and independent evidence. It is easy to ask the question, Is not the interpretation of an inspired person more to be depended on than our own? But a person may be inspired to a certain extent, and yet not inspired as an interpreter. Besides, the necessity of such interpretation is inconsistent with the alleged nature and purpose of prophecy, as independent evidence. A prophecy depending for its interpretation upon an inspired expositor, is nothing more nor less than a new revelation from such an expositor, and not an ancient prediction. Before the inspiration of the interpreter is proved, the prophecy is useless, and after this is proved, it is needless.

Thus may be seen the importance of distinguishing between two propositions, which are often confounded, namely, that Jesus is the Messiah predicted in the Old Testament, and that he is a teacher sent from God. They rest for support on entirely different kinds of evidence. The former is a question of interpretation and comparison. The latter rests on the evidence of miracles, and the records of history.

But though miracles are inappropriate evidence to prove the fulfillment of prophecy, may not the fulfillment of prophecy be useful for the confirmation, or essential to the existence, of faith in Jesus?

At first view, prophecy fulfilled seems better adapted to prove the authority of the author, than of the subject, of it. If Cyrus was predicted as the restorer of the Jews to their country, he is not thereby proved to have divine authority, though the prediction, if miraculous, proves the divine legation of the prophet.

It is true, however, that if a person, in whom a supernatural prophecy is clearly fulfilled, *claims* to be a divine messenger, the fulfillment of the prediction seems to be such an interposition of the Deity in his favor as sanctions his claims, and the proof becomes conclusive if the prophet declare his divine authority as a teacher. But then there are several

things to be proved in this case ; namely, the genuineness and antiquity of the prediction, and the facts that he, to whom the prediction is said to relate, claimed to be a divine messenger, and that the predictions were fulfilled in him in such a sense as to imply miraculous foreknowledge in the prophet. Miracles wrought by the person, who makes the claim to divine authority, seem a closer, and more convenient mode of proving it. Besides, unless the prediction relate to actions or events in their nature miraculous, there will always be room for the suspicion of mere coincidence of certain actions or events with the prediction, and for the objection, that one person may be said to fulfill it as well as another.

Had any one of the prophets been the author of such a sentence as this, "A great religious teacher shall arise in Judea, who shall prove his mission from God by raising the dead to life, and other miracles, and who, after being put to death by his enemies, shall have his own life restored to him upon this earth," — such a prediction might strengthen the conviction arising from the historical proof of those miracles. Nor would there, in regard to miraculous actions or events, be any ground for the common remark, that predictions could not be perfectly clear without danger of frustration from free agents.

Now as no prophet, when fairly expounded, seems to ascribe any thing miraculous to the Messiah, and as all of them seem to have spoken and written for the benefit of their contemporaries, we cannot but doubt whether prophecy was ever intended to afford direct and positive evidence of the divine mission of Jesus.

But if Jesus claimed, not only to be a divine messenger, but to be the Messiah predicted in the Old Testament, or if this latter claim were advanced by his Apostles, will not the failure to make the latter claim good, be fatal to the former claim? Will it not show that there is something unsound in the evidence, by which his claim to divine authority was supposed to be supported? This was admitted by the opponents of Collins. None of them had thought of the hypothesis that Jesus might have used the language of the times to set forth his claims to faith and obedience, without meaning to assert that, as a person, he had been the subject of particular predictions.

Accordingly all the opponents of Collins felt that the

authority of the Christian religion was connected with the proof of the proposition, that some predictions had been literally and properly fulfilled in Jesus. To the production of such proof, therefore, they directed their efforts.

In this part of the subject we are obliged to confess that we fail to receive satisfaction from the opponents of Collins, and, we may add, from other writers, who have undertaken to prove the fulfillment in Jesus of predictions relating, or supposed to relate, to a Messiah. We are, therefore, unwilling to admit that the truth of the Christian religion does in any sense depend upon the literal fulfillment of any predictions in the Old Testament by Jesus, as a person. We regard Christianity as supported by the intrinsic value of its doctrines and precepts, and their adaptation to the wants and weaknesses of mankind, and by the facts recorded in the gospel history; by the life, death, and resurrection of our Saviour. The Hebrew prophecies do not add any thing to the strength of our conviction arising from the historical evidence, that Jesus was a teacher sent from God. We should be sorry to suppose that this evidence would be affected by any view, which can be taken of the connexion between the Old Testament and the New; even by that view, which supposes that there are no proper predictions relating to Jesus, as a person, in the Old Testament.

That Jesus was the Messiah in the sense in which he claimed to be so, we are far from questioning. But whether he can be shown to be the subject of supernatural prophecy or not, he was anointed by God with the holy spirit, and with power to sustain the office of Instructor and Reformer of the world; he was sanctified and sent into the world to accomplish purposes of God, and to introduce a dispensation, for which the whole Jewish economy had been a preparation, and by which the best hopes and most ardent desires of prophets and righteous men would be more than answered. Might he not, then, claim to be the Messiah in the sense of being the agent of God for accomplishing purposes, which had been promoted by the preceding dispensation, and for introducing a more glorious dispensation for which the preceding had been a preparation, to which it tended, and in which it was designed to end?

The necessity, or at least the desirableness, of some such view, arises from the difficulty of showing that the passages

in the Old Testament which relate, or have been supposed to relate, to a Messiah, have been fulfilled in Jesus. This difficulty appears not only from the objections of unbelievers, but from the various and inconsistent interpretations of these passages by Christian scholars; from the theory of a double sense, and other theories, which maintain that the sense, which the prophets themselves assigned to their language, is not the true sense; from such references to the subject as that of Dr. Paley in his chapter upon Prophecy, and from various other indications.

Bishop Chandler adduces twelve * passages which he supposes to have been fulfilled in Jesus. Grotius applies to him only five. Paley brings forward but one, and that one supposed by Grotius to relate to the prophet Jeremiah. He alleges the discussion, that would be necessary to show their application, as a reason for not bringing forward more. The following are some of these passages.

Gen. xlix. 10. According to the common version, *The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.* But *Shiloh* is no where else used in Scripture as the name of a person, and of course not of the Messiah. It is used as the name of a place, and hence is more likely to be an abstract than a concrete noun. Moreover it is not probable that the Messiah would be introduced in the incidental way supposed by those, according to whom *Shiloh* denotes the Messiah. We think the meaning of the passage would be better represented by the following translation:

The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
Nor the staff from between his feet,
Until peace shall come,
And the nations shall obey him, [i. e. Judah.]

that is, Judah shall hold the leader's sceptre, until he shall have subdued his enemies, obtained peace, and secured the obedience of nations.

That מִחֵלֶךְ may denote *staff*, or *sceptre*, is evident from

* I. Mal. iii. 1. — II. Mal. iv. 5, 6. — III. Haggai ii. 6—9. — IV. Zech. ix. 9. — V. Zech. xii. 10. — VI. Dan. ii. 44, 45. — VII. Dan. vii. 13, 14. — VIII. Dan. ix. 24—27. — IX. Mic. v. 2. — X. Hab. ii. 3, 4. — XI. Amos ix. 11, 12. — XII. Is. lii. 13, &c.

Numb. xxi. 18. Thus the parallelism is better supported than by the rendering *lawgiver*, as also in Ps. lx. 7.

Ephraim shall be my helmet,

And Judah my sceptre, [מִחָקְקִי].

In regard to the application of the passage to Jesus, if we even suppose that *Shiloh* may be rendered *peacemaker*, and denote a Messiah, it will be hard to convince an unprejudiced man, that the sceptre did not depart from Judah during the captivity of seventy years.

Haggai ii. 7. I suppose it will now be generally admitted that by *the desire* of all nations is meant *the desirable* or *precious things* of all nations. The verb answering to *shall come*, בָּא, is in the plural form, whence it is probable that בָּאִים is either used in a collective sense, or that it should be pointed so as to be in the plural form. That it denotes *desirable, valuable things*, is probable from 1 Sam. ix. 20. The Septuagint renders it τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ, and in Sam. τὰ ὀραῖα. "Bishop Chandler thinks that בָּא cannot be used of things, but of persons only. Yet it is used of days perpetually, and of the ark, 2 Sam. vi. 9. and of mounts coming against Jerusalem, Jer. xxxii. 24., and of trees coming to adorn the temple, Is. lx. 13., and probably of the wealth of the Gentiles, ver. 5 (compare lxi. 6.), and of silver and gold coming into the temple, Josh. vi. 19."*

In regard to Ps. cx., comp. Christian Exam. Vol. V. p. 58. That our Saviour sometimes reasoned *ad hominem* without giving express notice of it, is evident from his language in Matt. xv. 26. "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to the dogs," &c. We intended to examine the most important prophecies, alleged by Grotius and by Bishop Chandler to have been literally fulfilled in Jesus. But we must abandon our purpose, as inconsistent with the limits of this article. We will only remark that a careful examination of them, and a consideration of the various and inconsistent modes of explaining them, will lead any one to hope that some such theory, as that proposed above, may be well grounded. Especially will this be the case, when he turns his attention to another class of passages.

There are various passages, which relate, and are com-

* Secker, as quoted by Newcome *ad loc.*

monly supposed to relate, to a Messiah, which it is difficult to reconcile with the character and condition of Jesus.

1. According to the common use of language, and the connexion in which the passages stand, and the circumstances under which they were written, many of them seem to denote a temporal king, a political sovereign, the head of a kingdom of this world. Such are the following.

“ For to us a child is born ;
To us a son is given,
And the government shall be upon his shoulder,
And he shall be called
Wonderful, counsellor, mighty potentate,
Everlasting father, prince of peace.
His dominion shall be great,
And peace without end shall rest
Upon the throne of David and his kingdom ;
He shall fix and establish it
Through justice and equity,
Henceforth and for ever. — Is. ix. 6, 7.

In that day shall the shoot of Jesse stand as a banner
for the people,
And to him shall the nations repair,
And his dwelling-place shall be glorious.
He shall set up a banner for the nations,
And gather the outcasts of Israel,
And bring together the dispersed of Judah
From the four extremities of the earth.
But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines at
the sea ;
Together shall they plunder the children of the East ;
Edom and Moab shall be their prey,
And the sons of Ammon shall be subject to them. — Is. xi.
10, 12, 14.

Behold a king shall reign in righteousness,
And princes shall rule with equity. — Is. xxxii. 1.

Behold the days are coming, saith Jehovah,
That I will raise up to David a righteous branch,
And a king shall reign and prosper,
And shall maintain justice and equity in the land ;
In his days Judah shall be saved,
And Israel shall dwell in security,
And this is the name, which shall be given him, Jehovah-is-
our-salvation. — Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.

In those days, at that time, will I cause the righteous
branch of David to grow up,

Who shall maintain justice and equity in the land.
 At that time Judah shall be saved,
 And Jerusalem shall dwell in security.
 And this is the name, which shall be given her, Jehovah-is-my-salvation." — Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16.

See also Ezek. xxxiv. 23 — 25. xxxvii. 24 — 26.

Whoever will examine the preceding passages in their connexion must, we think, receive a strong impression, that they relate to the Messiah expected by the Jews, and that he is represented in them as a powerful temporal king. It is true, that he is set forth as a *righteous* king; and a moral and religious reformation is represented as accompanying his reign. But this does not prove, that he is not also described as a political sovereign. Several Jewish kings were reformers in religion and morals.

It has, indeed, been said, that Jesus sustained the character of king after his resurrection and exaltation, when, according to his own assertion, all power was given him in heaven and earth. "He was a king," says Hengstenberg, * "in the truest and most literal sense, and of his kingdom every earthly one is only *an image and shadow*." But the true question is, not whether Jesus now exercises an influence over the willing soul, but whether he was a king in the place, and in the sense, in which the passages above quoted from the Hebrew prophets represent him to be such. This we leave to the judgment of our readers.

2. It seems to be the sense of the prophets, that the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom were to consist in the prosperity and glory of the Jewish nation, and to be obtained, in part, by victory and triumph over their enemies. See Mic. v. Is. xxv. 6, &c. xxix. 22, 23. xxx. 19 — 26. Joel iii. 9, &c. Is. xi. Mic. iv. 11 — 13. We wish our limits would allow us to quote at length, but must trouble the reader to consult the passages referred to for himself.

3. The prophets seem to have regarded the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom as belonging primarily to the Jewish nation, and as to be enjoyed by the rest of the world only by joining themselves to the Jews, and embracing their religion. See Is. ii. Mic. iv. Is. xxv. 6, &c. Ezek. xxvii. 28. This is stated by Jahn, an advocate of the double sense. "The prophets thought that it, i. e. the propagation

* Vol. I. p. 360.

of the true religion, was to be accomplished, either by the victories of the Hebrews inducing idolaters to acknowledge their God, who gave such proofs of his power, to be the true and only God; or by that method of conversion, which the Maccabees afterwards attempted." *

4. The prophets seem to have in view an office, and not a particular person, in their Messianic predictions. They speak of *a* king, rather than *the* king, and, though they lived at different periods, seem to speak of his coming, at no distant period from their own time. See the passages quoted above from Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

5. They seem to have described the same state of things, as to be introduced by different official characters; now by a king, now by a prophet, or by the prophetic order, under the name of the "servant of God." Will the laws of language allow us to admit that Is. liii. refers to the same character as those passages which describe a triumphant king? It is true, that a person once in a low condition, like David, might afterwards be exalted to a throne; and hence it might be said that Is. liii. referred to one period of his life, and the other passages to a succeeding period. But this supposition will not remove the difficulty. For the same blessings are represented at one time as the consequence of the victories of a mighty prince, and, at another, as the consequence of the sufferings and exertions of a prophet, or of the prophetic order. See Is. lii. liii. liv., compared with the passages quoted on page 330.

6. The prophets represent the events of the Messiah's kingdom as near, and connected with events, which happened before Jesus appeared, such as the destruction of certain nations, and the return of the Jews from captivity, as may appear from most of the preceding quotations and references. It has been said, indeed, that events were revealed to the prophets "in space, not in time;" and that hence, they were ignorant of the time, when they were to happen. But something more than ignorance is implied in their representing these events as near. If they supposed themselves ignorant of the time, when the events they predict were to happen, why do they with confidence represent them to be near? Besides, the remark that events were revealed to them in space, not in time, will not apply in any intelligible sense to

* Jahn's Introduction, § 82, p. 310. American translation.

a great part of the prophetic writings, which consists of affirmations, or declarations, not to be represented by pictures.

Now Jesus was not a temporal king, nor a victorious prince; he did not lead the Jewish nation to prosperity and glory; and other nations became partakers of the blessings of his religion, not by becoming appendages and tributaries to the Jewish nation. In fine, Christianity was established by the destruction of the nation, and not by its triumph. If then the obvious sense, which the prophets attached to their language, be the true sense, many of their predictions are not to be reconciled with the character and fortunes of Jesus and his religion. This conclusion is adopted by writers of different sentiments, such as Jahn, an advocate of the double sense, and Hengstenberg and others, who maintain that the sense, which the prophets attached to their own language, is not necessarily the true sense.

The design of the peculiar theory of Hengstenberg respecting the nature of prophecy was, if we mistake not, to establish the last mentioned proposition, viz. that the sense, which the prophets attached to their language, is not necessarily the true sense. In the view of the author himself, the correctness of his application and interpretation of many passages, which he regards as literally fulfilled in Jesus, depends upon the correctness of that proposition. The value, therefore, of his work depends principally upon the correctness of his views respecting a great principle of interpretation. If it be true, that we are to apply the same principles of interpretation to the Bible, which we do to all other books, and are to believe that we have discovered the true meaning of a passage, when we have discovered the meaning which the writer attached to his language, then the work of Hengstenberg is of no value, so far as its principal object is concerned. No confidence is to be placed in the correctness of his application or interpretation of the language of the prophets. He has proceeded in opposition to a fundamental principle of interpretation, now generally acknowledged, viz. that a writer's meaning is that which he attaches to the language, which he uses.

We shall not go into the defence of a principle so generally acknowledged. We write for those, who have no belief in double senses, or in plenary verbal inspiration. We will, however, endeavour to state the views of the nature of

prophecy, on which our author's interpretation of the prophetic writings is founded.

The prominent feature of our author's theory of the nature of prophecy is, that the prophets were not in the possession of their own understandings when they received, and when they uttered, their prophecies. To use his own language "They were in a state of ecstasy (ἐκστασις)," i. e. according to his definition, "a state in which intelligent consciousness (verständige Bewusstseyn) retired, and individual agency (Selbstleben) was entirely suppressed by a powerful operation of the divine Spirit, and reduced to a state of passiveness. Thus the prophets, as Philo said, were interpreters, whose organs God employed in making known his revelations." *

Again he says, "We may apply to the true prophets what Plato enlarges upon in *Ion* and *Phædrus*, viz. that with prophecy there is necessarily connected the suppression of human activity and intelligent consciousness. But the nature of the prophetic condition is very appropriately described by Philo.† 'While the mind sheds its light around us, pouring into our souls a meridian splendor, we, being in possession of ourselves, are not under a supernatural influence. But after the sun has gone down, as might be expected, an ecstasy, a divine influence, and a phrensy, falls on us. For when the divine light shines, the human goes down; but when the former goes down, the latter rises and comes forth. This is what ordinarily happens in prophecy. Our own mind retires on the advent of the divine spirit; but after the latter has departed, the former again returns. For it is not becoming that the mortal and immortal should dwell together. Consequently the retirement of reason, and the darkness connected with it, is followed by an ecstasy and a divine phrensy.' " ‡

In dispossessing the prophet of his understanding, it seems to have been the opinion of Hengstenberg, that the Deity found some difficulty. "Sometimes the internal struggle of the divinity with humanity was so great, that the prophets tore off their clothes from their bodies;" § i. e., to change

* Vol. I, p. 294. We avail ourselves of the translation in the Andover "Repository," having compared it with the original.

† Quis rerum div. sit hæres, p. 404, edit. Hoesch.

‡ Vol. I. p. 297.

§ p. 296.

his misty abstractions into concrete terms, the Creator of heaven and earth had a contest with the minds of the prophets, the latter being unwilling to resign the possession of their understandings; and the contest was so hot, that the prophets were obliged to throw off their clothes!

Such, according to our author, was the state into which the prophets were brought, as a preparation for their receiving and publishing divine communications. They were dispossessed of their intelligent consciousness, and reduced to a state of entire passiveness. Before we go farther in the statement of his views, we will stop, not to adduce objections to what has already been stated, but to inquire what is his evidence for his allegations. What he represents as the condition of the prophets is a great, and apparently an unnecessary, miracle. For we can see no reason why communications might not be made by the Deity to the human mind in its natural state. The burden of proof rests, therefore, upon the author of such a theory. Were it not for the purpose of illustrating our author's judgment as an interpreter, and justifying the remarks we made respecting him at the beginning of this article, we should hardly think it worth while to examine the arguments for such a theory.

"That they were seized by the Spirit of God, and that in a forcible manner, which suppressed for the time their own agency," he regards as "denoted by the expressions, 'The hand of God, or the Spirit of God, came, or fell on the prophet;' e. g. Ezek. i. 3; 1 Sam. xix. 20, &c.; 2 Kings iii. 15; 2 Chron. xv. 1."*

Of these passages the last introduces, not a prophecy, but an exhortation; that in Samuel relates to the case of the messengers of Saul, who are not commonly supposed to have received divine communications. But supposing all the passages referred to contained prophecies, where did our author learn that the hand of God deprived those on whom it fell, of their agency, or dispossessed them of their understandings? What child, old enough to attend one of our Sunday schools, does not know that the expressions in question are often used without reference to prophecy, or even to a supernatural interposition of the Deity. Thus in Neh. ii. 8. We read, "The king granted me according to the good hand

* p. 295.

of God upon me." And in Judges vi. 34: "But the Spirit of the Lord came upon Gideon, and he blew a trumpet and sent messengers."

"The irresistibleness of this seizure," says our author, "is also indicated in Jer. xx. 7, by these words, 'Lord, thou hast persuaded me, and I have suffered myself to be persuaded; thou hast been too strong for me, and hast prevailed.'"* We think he has translated the verse correctly; and the obvious meaning of it is, that, though the fear of contempt and danger urged him to forbear the discharge of his office as a prophet, yet conscience and the motives arising from his relation to God, urged him to deliver his message, and prevailed. Why should the strong language of the latter part of the verse be understood according to the letter, rather than the softer expressions of the former part of it? Who does not know that in Scripture and in common conversation, similar or still stronger expressions are used to denote the influence of persuasion. Thus it is said, Our Saviour *could* not perform miracles because of the unbelief of the Nazarenes. Mark vi. 5. Thus it is commonly said, I *cannot* resist your intreaties. The general meaning of the verse is illustrated by chap. i. 5-8.

Another passage brought by our author in support of his theory is 2 Pet. i. 21.† "Holy men of God spake as they were moved (*περσόμενοι*) by the Holy Ghost." But this proves only that these holy men spake under the influence of the holy spirit, not that they were deprived of their own agency, or dispossessed of their understandings.

Again says our author, "The unusualness of the prophetic condition appears from the fact that unbelievers supposed the prophets to be insane. Thus, in 2 Kings ix. 11, the courtiers of Jehu say to him, 'Wherefore came this mad fellow to thee?' Compare a perfectly similar passage in Jer. xxix. 26."‡ Here is a specimen of our author's logic and sense. The *courtiers* of Jehu call a prophet, known to be disagreeable to their master, a mad fellow; therefore the prophet must be supposed to be deprived of his voluntary agency, and dispossessed of intelligent consciousness. For the *unusualness* of the prophet's condition must amount to this, or be nothing to our author's purpose. It may be admitted that there was something unusual in the appear-

* Vol. I. p. 295.

† Ibid.

‡ p. 296.

ance of a prophet. They appear to have spoken under strong emotion, and with violent gesticulation. Their messages, too, were often of an extraordinary character. These circumstances are enough to account for the remarks of scoffers concerning them. St. Paul was once pronounced to be beside himself, when he was unusually earnest upon an important subject. So the Pharisees said of Jesus, "He hath a dæmon and is mad, why hear ye him?" And so, too, we may add, his relations said, "He is beside himself."

Such are the most important, and indeed nearly all, the arguments urged by our author in support of the fundamental principle of his work, that upon which, in its consequences, he regards the value of his work as depending. "There can then," says he with great complacency, "be no doubt that the Hebrew prophets, as well as the heathen diviners, were in an ecstasy, i. e. deprived of their own voluntary agency, and dispossessed of their intelligent consciousness."* We have thus a fair specimen of the process, by which he arrives at his undoubted conclusions. We are not surprised to find such a writer engaged in publishing for the benefit of his countrymen such works as Scott's *Force of Truth*.†

Our author, it must be observed, holds the opinion, that the prophets were in the same condition, when they uttered, as when they received, divine communications. And all his reasonings are founded on the supposition, that what they uttered we now have in their written works; i. e., that the prophetic writings are not merely the views entertained by the prophets concerning the divine communications which were made to them, but are the divine communications themselves.

But to proceed with our author's theory. In order that the prophet may be a competent recipient of divine communications when dispossessed of his understanding, or of intelligent consciousness, he reserves to him what he calls the *internal sense*. "All impressions were made upon the internal sense, which was furnished (befruchtet) by the Divine Spirit, while reflection and the external senses were at rest."‡

* p. 296.

† Among the recent publications at Berlin we find an advertisement of the following: "Scott T., Die Kraft der Wahrheit, eine wahre Geschichte, herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. E. W. Hengstenberg."

‡ p. 299.

With regard to this internal sense our author appears to be inconsistent with himself. He defines it to be the faculty of immediate perception. From this definition and from the nature of the prophetic writings, it ought to include not only the faculty of perceiving images or pictures, but also of perceiving spoken words. It ought to be an internal sense of hearing, as well as of seeing. At least as great a portion of the prophetic writings is occupied in the relation of what Jehovah spake, or of what the prophets heard, as of what they saw. And yet, in other passages, our author draws important conclusions from the supposition that this internal sense was mental vision alone in its etymological sense, corresponding to the outward sense of sight. Thus he says: "If the prophets received all their communications in mental vision, it follows that these must have been given by images, or pictures. For all immediate knowledge is an image or picture, while abstract ideas belong only to knowledge obtained in a different way." * Again: "The prophets were describers of pictures rather than chronological historians." † Again he says, "To the view of the prophets events could be given only in the relation of juxtaposition, not in that of *succession*." ‡ And again: "Not unfrequently, instead of events being presented in juxtaposition, they appear as blended together; just as, when the view is directed to a distance, objects flow into one another, and those seem to be connected, which are in reality far apart." § And again: "The prophets viewed the future only in space, not in time, and hence, near and remote events, similar to each other, were not unfrequently presented to the view of the prophets as contiguous, or *even lying one upon another*," || (aneinander stiessen oder sich gar deckten.) Such is the desperation with which a man of considerable learning can pursue a theory, not only in defiance of the most obvious matters of fact, but in contradiction to himself. It is to be recollected that he regards the prophets as *speaking* in a state of ecstasy, as well as seeing. The description, therefore, of what they saw must be regarded as the divine communication, as well as the vision itself. All that they uttered and wrote, he regards as having God for its *immediate* author. But do the Books

* Vol. I. p. 312.

§ p. 308.

† p. 306.

|| p. 324.

‡ p. 307.

of Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Micah, contain nothing but images or pictures, or descriptions of images, or pictures? Do they contain no abstract declarations, no narratives, no expostulations? Do they contain no accounts of what Jehovah *spake*, as well as of what he presented to the vision of the prophets?

The assertion that all, or the greater part, of the contents of the prophetic books was seen in space is in fact rank nonsense. No one can read scarcely a page of any one of the prophetic books, which does not contain matter, which from its nature is incapable of being represented in space. If this be so, then the alleged necessity that the relations of time should be disregarded, and that events, which were to happen in different ages, should be placed in juxtaposition or lie one upon the other in the same passage or sentence, is done away. The idea that the relations of time were disregarded by the prophets, rather than the relations of space, would hardly occur to any one, who should read their writings unbiassed by theory. We do not mean that they intended to state the exact time of all the events, which they predicted. But that they confounded the relations of time in the composition of their writings we believe to be an unmerited reproach.

If the mere images or pictures, alleged to have been presented to the prophets in vision, were all that was claimed as divine, and if the description of these visions, and all in the prophetic writings besides visions, were held to be only the human views, which the prophets took of divine communications, there might be more plausibility in the allegation that the prophets disregarded the relations of time. But as the prophets are represented by this writer, as delivering, as well as receiving, divine communications in a state of ecstasy, i. e. as mere organs of the Deity, there is no room for such a distinction. He represents God as the immediate author of the whole, and the prophet as no more than the pen used in writing it.* But is God the author of confusion and error? Has he placed events, belonging to different ages of the world, in juxtaposition, and made them lie upon each other, and so described them in written

* Much, however, occurs in the "Christology," which is inconsistent with this opinion. Consistency is hardly to be expected in such a writer.

composition, as that by the laws of language all readers, at least before the fulfillment of the predictions, would suppose that they were to happen at the same, or nearly the same time. Believe this, who will. We cannot give up our reason to make way for such revelations.

We have thus endeavoured to give some account of the condition and manner, in which, according to our author, the prophets received and delivered divine communications. From this theory he goes on, in his wordy, misty way, to deduce certain properties of prophecy, of which we shall take notice of only one, that which he evidently regards as the most important, and which, as we suppose, the theory was constructed to support.

"The prophets," says he, "were only organs of the Divine Spirit, and what they said during their ecstasy, and the consequent suppression of intelligent consciousness, cannot have been accompanied with a correct or incorrect understanding. Hence, in this respect, they stood in the same relation to their predictions, as their hearers or their readers did, *so that their apprehensions as to the meaning of what they communicated cannot determine the true sense.*" *

This is evidently the most important feature of this writer's theory, for it immediately affects, or rather subverts, a fundamental principle of interpretation. In all other compositions, when we have arrived at the meaning, which, in view of the use of language, of the connexion of the discourse, and the various circumstances under which he wrote, must be regarded as the meaning of the writer, we think we have found the true meaning. But if, as this writer maintains, the true meaning of predictions might be, and often was, hidden from the prophets themselves, and their contemporaries, and left to be ascertained principally by their fulfillment, then all who attempt to find the meaning of a prediction, at least before its fulfillment, are engaged in a hopeless undertaking; they cannot do it, until man can by searching find out God.

Hengstenberg maintains, indeed, that his view is not inconsistent with the principle of interpretation, that an interpreter must always make it his final aim to find the sense, which the *author* had in view, because the proper author of

* Vol. I. p. 317.

the prophecies is God alone, and the prophet only his instrument.

But, without contending against a view of the authorship of the sacred writings, now maintained by few interpreters of any denomination in this, or any other country, I may ask, whether this very view does not contradict an equally fundamental principle of interpretation, namely, that every author means and expects to be understood by those, through whom, and to whom he speaks. Is it a supposition worthy of God, that he has spoken in language, which could not be understood for ages after it was spoken? Is it worthy of God to speak in language, which shall necessarily be misunderstood? For the words, which the prophets uttered and wrote, were not unmeaning sounds or characters to themselves, or their contemporaries. They are words, to which, according to the common use of language, both the prophets, and their contemporaries, and succeeding generations, must attach some meaning, an erroneous one, if not the true one. Hengstenberg does not flinch from this consequence. He expressly maintains, that the erroneous views, necessarily derived from the sacred writings by the writers and readers of them, were adapted to have a better influence than the truth!* A proposition, we hesitate not to say, tending to the subversion of the foundation of religion natural and revealed. For, if the Supreme Being may directly and intentionally deceive his creatures in one important particular, where can they find confidence, that there is not error and deception in the whole scheme of Revelation, and of Providence?

Our author says, that the principal means of understanding the prophecies, is their fulfillment.† Fulfillment of what? What is fulfillment? Is it not the agreement of actions or events with something predicted, in such a manner as to imply miraculous foreknowledge in the predictor? Now, how are we to discover such an agreement, but by the comparison of certain actions or events with language of which we understand the meaning? You assert that certain events determine the meaning of what you confess you did not understand before the occurrence of the events. But your neighbour asserts that events of a different kind determine the meaning of the same prediction, and determine it to be

* p. 329.

† p. 319.

different from that; which you assign to it. What right have you to contradict him?

Many writers have spoken like Hengstenberg, of a necessary obscurity of prophetic language. If predictions had been perfectly clear, say they, the fulfillment of such as depend on the concurrence of free agents might have been frustrated. How unworthy is such a supposition of a being, "who turneth the hearts of men as the rivers of water are turned, who taketh the wise in their own craftiness, and whose counsel shall stand in spite of all the devices of man's heart!" This remark applies to predictions of ordinary events. But how the fulfillment of predicted events, in their nature miraculous, could be defeated, if it had been the will of God to reveal them, is still less conceivable.

We are compelled to believe, that much which has been written concerning the necessary obscurity of prophecy, is but learned dust, raised in order to conceal from the writers themselves and others the actual difficulties of the subject; difficulties arising from the comparison of what, according to the common rules of interpretation, we may be confident that we do understand with the history of the Jewish nation, the life and character of Jesus, and the state of things since his appearance; and from the application of passages in the Old Testament by writers in the New.

These difficulties account for the formation of theories so much at war with common sense as that of Hengstenberg, and the theory of a double sense, which differs from the former only in this, that it assigns two meanings to prophetic language, both of which are supposed to be true, while, according to Hengstenberg, such language has two meanings, one false, and the other true.

We have seen that Hengstenberg rejects a principle of interpretation, which is almost universally regarded as fundamental, namely, that the meaning, which any writer assigns to his language, is the true meaning. We are, therefore, relieved from the necessity of examining the correctness of his application and interpretation of particular prophecies. We cannot reason with such an interpreter. They, who differ from him in respect to so important a principle, can have no confidence in the correctness of his application of any particular passages to the Messiah. A book written upon such principles must,

in their estimation, be worthless, so far as its principal object is concerned.

It cannot be doubted, that the rejection of the principle, that the meaning of a writer is that, which he himself connected with his words, was caused by a regard to the authority of the Christian Revelation. The application of this principle to the prophecies, has been supposed to lead to consequences injurious to Christianity. It is, nevertheless, deeply founded in the common sense of mankind ; the same common sense to which the proofs and interpretation of the Christian Revelation are addressed. We have seen to what extravagances Hengstenberg has been led, in endeavouring to find support for a different principle. It is necessary, therefore, to find out some other method of reconciling the consequences of a correct interpretation of the Old Testament with the authority of Christianity.

One of these consequences is that, which we have already set forth, namely, that several predictions, generally supposed to relate to the Messiah, and to the establishment of his kingdom, seem not to be reconcilable with the life and character of Jesus ; and that it is difficult to point out any predictions, which have been properly fulfilled in Jesus.

Another consequence of regarding the meaning of the writers as the true meaning of the prophetic writings is, that the Evangelists and Apostles seem to understand these writings in a sense different from that, which we have reason to believe to be the true sense.

These consequences have been admitted, in part, at least, by some of the advocates of a double sense ; and, though the fact is not formally acknowledged by Hengstenberg, it is evidently the perception of it, that led to his theory.

We think it consistent with the divine authority of Christ to admit, that the Evangelists and Apostles have applied the language of the prophets to persons and facts, to which in the mind of the prophets they had no relation, and this, not merely for the purpose of rhetorical illustration and confirmation, but of proving a real fulfillment of prophecy. Such an application of Is. vii. 14, is, in our opinion, made in Matthew, i. 23, and of Psalm xvi. by Peter and Paul in Acts ii. 25—31. xiii. 34—37. We will examine these cases in order to justify the admission we have made.

The writer, having given an account of the miraculous con-

ception of Jesus, goes on to say : " Now all this was done, or came to pass, that it might be fulfilled, which the Lord spake by the Prophet, ' Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son,' &c." Now, if we examine this passage in Isaiah, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion, that it relates to a young woman who lived, and to a child who was to be born, in the days of Ahaz, king of Judah. It appears from the connexion, in which it stands, that Ahaz, king of Judah, terrified by a threatened invasion of the combined forces of the kings of Israel and Syria, had determined to apply to the king of Assyria for aid. From this determination the Prophet endeavoured to dissuade Ahaz, and in so doing, promised him *a sign*, by which he should be convinced, that his deliverance from the forces of those kings would be sure and speedy. This sign was, that a young marriageable woman, the actual or betrothed wife of the prophet, should be delivered of a male child, so that Ahaz, seeing the fulfillment of this promise, might be confident that the promised deliverance connected with the sign would be accomplished, before this child should learn to choose the good, and refuse the evil. Now how could the birth of Jesus, seven hundred years after the time of Ahaz, be a *sign* to him of his deliverance from the kings of Israel and Syria? This question has been often asked, but never answered. Hengstenberg endeavours to avoid the difficulty, as follows.* He first assumes, in defiance of the context, and of the purpose for which the prophet came to Ahaz, that the prophet addressed the words in question, not to the king, but to the pious part of the people. He assumes, too, what cannot be proved, that the expectation of a Messiah to be born of a virgin was common at the time. He then asserts, that the prophet, turning from the king and addressing the pious part of the people, says, " As surely as your expected Messiah is to come, so surely shall the nation, in which he is to be born, and the royal family from which he is to spring, be preserved from destruction." But on the supposition, unwarrantable as it is, that Ahaz was surrounded with pious people, and that Isaiah addressed them rather than the scoffing king, we still have no *sign*, but only an affirmation. A *sign*, according to Scripture usage, surely means something more than a simple

* Vol. II. p. 47.

affirmation. In fact, the explanation of Hengstenberg is in defiance of not one only, but several established rules of interpretation.

In regard to the word *הַעַלְמָה* rendered *virgin* in the common version, we suppose it to denote a young woman of marriageable age, and who might, or might not, be married.* It is not this word, but another, *בְּתוּלָה*, that is used to denote the condition of a virgin. Compare Prov. xxx. 19. From ch. viii. 1 — 4, 18, and from the circumstance that the children of the prophets were accustomed to have symbolic names,† we have reason to suppose, that the wife of the prophet Isaiah was intended by *הַעַלְמָה*, and his son by Immanuel. This has been inferred by some eminent critics from the use of the article in connexion with the word. *The* young woman signifies, according to them, the young woman belonging to me, i. e. *my* young woman. So in colloquial English, it is not uncommon to hear the remark, I will see what *the* woman says, meaning, *my* wife. See Gesenius' Latin and Heb. Lex. article *ה*.

This passage in Isaiah, then, had, in the mind of the prophet, no relation to Jesus.

But was it the design of the writer to make use of it as a proper prediction relating to Jesus? Might he not have intended to make a mere rhetorical application of the passage, merely accommodating the language of Isaiah to the purpose of his narrative? Might he not have intended merely to point out a coincidence between what happened relating to Jesus, and the language used by the prophet respecting another occurrence? Such is the view taken of the passage by many writers, such as Dr. Sykes, ‡ Dr. Campbell, § and Dr. Eckermann, || the last named of whom regards all the applications of the words of the Old Testament to the life and circumstances of Jesus, as mere accommodations of the language of the Old Testament to something which is recorded in the New. According to them, the meaning of the Evangelist is, that the conception of Jesus was of such a character, that the words of Isaiah might be fitly used in describing it. I am not able to extract this meaning from the

* See Gesen. and Winer's Lex. ad verb. † See vii. 3. viii. 3. Hosea i. 4, 8, 9. ‡ Truth of the Christian Religion, Ch. xiii.

§ In his note on the verse. || Theologische Beytrage, p. 25, *et seq.*

original without doing violence to the language of the writer, τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν, ἵνα πληρωθῇ. "Now all this was done, took place, or happened, that it might be fulfilled." This appears to me to be the plain sense of the words. The translations of Wakefield and the Improved Version, seem to me to be bad English. "Now all this was done, so that it was fulfilled;" unless they supposed the meaning of the verse to be, that "all was done *in such a manner*, as that it was fulfilled," &c. But this is hardly probable. They knew very well, that very different language would have been used in Greek to express that meaning. I admit, that nothing in opposition to the meaning, which is supported by Sykes and others, can be inferred from the verb πληρωθῇ, or even from the particle ἵνα, in itself considered,* and if it commenced a new clause. But following the words τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν, *all this was done*, or *took place*, and this too in reference to a miraculous event of such a character, I cannot help believing the particle ἵνα, to be used in its common signification, *in order that*, and that it is correctly rendered in the common version.

The object of the New Testament writers in making quotations from the Old, is to be learned from the circumstances of the case, and from what we know to have been the prevalent principles of interpretation at that time.† It is not to be forgotten, that though the Jews sometimes used the form of quotation ἵνα πληρωθῇ and others for purposes, which may be called rhetorical, yet that the common use of such forms was to call attention to the real fulfillment of a prediction. It is to be remembered, that words at that time were regarded as a sort of real essences, and not merely as signs of ideas in the mind of him, who used them, and that the Jews regarded many passages of the Old Testament as predictions of their Messiah, which have no claim to that character. Now why might not the Evangelists and Apostles adopt the hermeneutics and logic, as well as the rhetoric, of their contemporaries? Why might they not make an application of a text of Scripture, which the established principles of interpretation

* See the Christian Examiner, Vol. V. p. 54, *et seq.*

† See valuable information on this subject, in the Christian Examiner, Vol. V. p. 38-43. See also Hermeneutik der Neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller, by Döpke. Leipsic, 1829.

now pronounce to be incorrect, as well as an application of it, which established principles of rhetoric now pronounce to be nugatory? Mat. ii. 15, is usually considered an undoubted instance, in which the form of quotation denotes merely a rhetorical use of the language. To me it appears quite as creditable to the writer to suppose that he regarded that text as a typical prophecy, as to suppose that he made such a solemn parade of Scripture language for the mere purpose of relating the fact, that the infant Jesus, having been carried into Egypt, was brought back by his parents. It may be said, that such was the rhetoric of the day. We reply, Such was the interpretation of the day. However this may be, the former case of ch. i. 23, seems to be a decided one of incorrect interpretation on the part of the Evangelist, if, indeed, he be the writer of the first two chapters of the Gospel ascribed to him. He is an honest and capable historian of the life and doctrines of Jesus, as such entirely worthy of our confidence. But it did not please God to make him an infallible interpreter.

The next case, which we shall adduce, is independent of any form of quotation. It is that of the use of the sixteenth Psalm by the Apostles Peter and Paul in Acts ii. 25 — 31, and xiii. 34 — 37. Both of them endeavour to prove, that a part of the psalm applies to Jesus, and not to David. A mere rhetorical application, or accommodation, cannot be maintained here.

Yet if we apply to this psalm the common principles of interpretation, we cannot come to the conclusion, that the writer had in his mind the meaning assigned to his language by the Apostles. This psalm, with the inscription, should, we think, be translated thus.

A writing, or psalm of David.

- Preserve me, O God, for to thee do I look for help;
2 I have said to Jehovah, Thou art my Lord;
I have no happiness without thee!
3 The holy that are in the land, and the excellent,
In them is all my delight.
4 They, who hasten after other gods, shall have multiplied sorrows;

- Their drink-offerings of blood I will not offer,
 Nor will I take their names upon my lips.
 5 Jehovah is my portion and my cup ;
 Thou wilt maintain my lot !
 6 My portion hath fallen to me in pleasant places ;
 Yea, I have a goodly inheritance.
 7 I will bless Jehovah, who careth for me ;
 Yea in the night my heart admonisheth me. [i. e. *to praise him.*]
 8 I set Jehovah before me at all times ;
 Since he is at my right hand, I shall not fall.
 9 Therefore my heart is glad and my spirit rejoiceth ;
 My flesh also dwelleth in security.
 10 For thou wilt not give me up to the grave,
 Nor wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see the pit.
 11 Thou wilt show me the path of life ;
 In thy presence is fulness of joy ;
 At thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.

Now as soon as we begin to read this psalm, we receive the impression, that it relates to a person then living, and not to one, who was to live many hundred years afterwards ; and that the author of it is also the subject of it. One is represented as speaking in the first person, and not spoken of in the third. Nor is there in the inscription, nor in any part of the psalm, any intimation, that the writer had in view any person, except himself, as the subject of the petition, or that he is expressing the feelings of any one except himself. He, therefore, gave his readers as good ground to believe that he was the subject of the psalm, as if he had expressly declared it. We shall also endeavour to show, that the language of the psalm is more applicable to David, or any pious Jew of his time, in circumstances of trouble and danger, than to Jesus.

The third and fourth verses are evidently more applicable to a pious king, or person of distinction, professing to patronize the worshippers of Jehovah rather than those that were inclined to idolatry, than to Jesus. The fourth verse indicates, that the person, who is the subject of the psalm, was living amongst those, who hastened after other gods, and that he was tempted to imitate them. How much better this is suited to the times of David, than to those of Jesus, when idolatry was the universal abhorrence of the Jews, is

obvious. The expression, *They, who hasten after other gods*, seems to point to idolatrous Jews, rather than to the heathen, long sunk in idolatry.

The line, "Nor will I take their names upon my lips," means, I suppose, "I will have no intercourse with them." This is more in the spirit of a Jew of that age, than of him who sat at meat with publicans and sinners, and came to seek and save that which was lost.

Verses fifth and seventh, seem to me to indicate external condition, and if so, to be more applicable to David, or some other person, than to him who had not where to lay his head.

The seventh and eighth verses might have been uttered by any pious Jew. The words בִּלְאִפְסֵי, *I shall not fall*, are by some understood in a moral sense, *I waver not*, or *lose not my confidence*. In either case, however, the person speaking evidently feels safe. It is not destruction or death, but danger, from which he trusts that God will deliver him.

Verse ninth expresses the writer's feeling of security, or fearlessness of danger, in a still stronger manner. But this verse requires more particular illustration. I need not stop to prove, what every one acquainted with Hebrew phraseology will admit, that "my heart" and "my spirit,"* are but periphrases for the personal pronoun *I*. *My flesh* has been supposed by some to denote the *dead body*. But the same Hebrew idiom, the connexion of the discourse, and the parallelism of the verse clearly show, that "*my flesh*" is but a periphrasis of the personal pronoun *I*; "my heart," and "my spirit," and "my flesh" being only an emphatic expression to denote the whole person. Thus, Ps. lxxxiv. 2.

My soul longeth, yea panteth, for the courts of Jehovah;
My heart and *my flesh* cry aloud for the living God.

So in lxiii. 1.

O God, thou art my God! earnestly do I seek thee!
My soul thirsteth, my flesh longeth for thee, &c.

See also cxix. 120. These examples alone are sufficient to show conclusively, that *my flesh* has no exclusive reference to the inanimate part of man, and is but a periphrasis for the

* The most literal meaning of the original, is either *my glory*, i. e. my most distinguished part, or more probably, *my liver*.

first personal pronoun; so that the line might be rendered, "I shall dwell in security."

What is meant by *dwelling in security* is to be learned from the use of the phrase לָקַטַּח in other passages, from the connexion, and the parallelism. These three considerations seem to me to prove conclusively, that the meaning is either, *I shall live safe* from the calamity which threatens, or in a moral sense, which we prefer, *I shall live secure or fearless*. Precisely the same expression is used in Deut. xxxiii. 12, translated in the common version, "The beloved of the Lord shall *dwell in safety* by him." The same also in Judges xviii. 7, "How they *dwelt careless* after the manner of the Sidonians." Jer. xxiii. 6, and xxxiii. 16, "Israel shall dwell safely." Compare also Deut. xxxiii. 28; Judges viii. 11; Lev. xxv. 18, 19; Is. xlvii. 8; Ps. iv. 8; Ezek. xxx. 9; 1 Kings iv. 25.

Whoever will weigh well the preceding passages must be convinced that usage, *usus loquendi*, requires the meaning to be, *I shall be safe from calamity*, or *I shall be fearless of calamity*. It is not hope to escape from calamity, in which one is already involved, but confidence that one will not fall into it, that is denoted by the expression.

That this is the meaning, appears also from the connexion. From the beginning of the psalm to the line under consideration, there is not the slightest intimation that the person praying expected to die. On the contrary we find him exulting in the confidence of divine protection, in the preceding line. It is, therefore, a violent and unaccountable transition, that he should conceive of himself as dead, and of his body as lying in the grave, in this line. Thus we see that one cannot make this line signify, *My dead body shall rest in the grave*, without disregard of three important considerations, which oppose such a meaning, viz. usage, the connexion of the discourse, and the parallelism; not to mention the incongruity of attributing hope to a dead body lying in the grave.

We are now prepared to proceed to the next verse, בִּלְאֵל תַּעֲזֹב נַפְשִׁי לְשָׁאוֹל, translated in the common version, *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*. Here every scholar will admit that *my soul* denotes *me*, and that the word, rendered *hell*, here denotes simply *the place of the dead*, and that the word *grave* sufficiently expresses its general meaning.

It only requires recurrence to any Hebrew Lexicon to be convinced, that the preposition is wrongly translated in the common version, and that it should be *to* instead of *in*. The preposition would have been ל instead of ב to express the meaning of the common version. Even in the Acts, it is rendered, not *ἐν ᾧδῃ*, but *εἰς ᾧδῃν*, or *ᾧδου*, and in the Sept. *εἰς ᾧδῃν*. We suppose, therefore, that all will approve of the translation, *Thou wilt not leave me to the grave*. Now these words may be regarded as in themselves ambiguous. They may mean, *Thou wilt not suffer me to be committed to the grave*, i. e. to die, or *Thou wilt not abandon me to the possession of the grave* after I am buried. We believe the former meaning to be best supported by the connexion, and by usage. We left the person, who is speaking, safe and fearless of calamity, confident that he should not fall into it. Instead of regarding himself as near death, or dead, or in the grave, he was exulting and secure in the divine protection. It is therefore a very violent transition, that he should here conceive of himself as dead and buried.

In regard to usage, Ps. xlix. 10, is a case in point. Here the same verb and preposition are used in the line, "*And leave their wealth to others.*" Here the wealth was not in the possession of others before it was left to them. The same verb and preposition are used in Job xxxix. 14, where the strict meaning is, *She commits her eggs to the ground*. For who that is acquainted with the Hebrew prepositions, can doubt that ל instead of ב would have been used, if the meaning had been, that she abandoned what was already in the ground? In Job xxxix. 11, the same verb is used with the preposition ל , "Or wilt thou leave, i. e. commit, thy labor to him?" In Ps. x. 14, the same verb is used with the preposition ל ; "The poor committeth himself to thee." See also Job x. 1; Is. x. 3; Jer. xlix. 11. From these instances we feel authorized to draw the conclusion, that the verb in question, followed by the preposition ל or a similar one, denotes committal to a person or place, not abandoning in a place. When rest in a place is denoted, as in Exod. ix. 21, "He that regarded not the word of the Lord, left his cattle in the field," the preposition ב is used.

Hengstenberg, while he admits that the correct rendering is, *Thou wilt not leave, or give me up, to the grave*, supposes

that Sheol is here represented not as a place, but as a rapacious monster; and that the meaning is, "Thou wilt not abandon me to the power of *Sheol*," so as *to be retained* by it. It is true that in Isaiah v. 14, in reference to the vast numbers that were to be slain, *Sheol*, or Hades, is represented in highly figurative language, as a monster enlarging his greedy throat. So in Proverbs, it is represented as one of those things, which never have enough. But this is not the common conception of Sheol in the Hebrew poets. It is used more than fifty times in the Old Testament, and the passages in Isaiah and Proverbs are, we believe, the only places where it is not manifestly conceived of as a place. Sometimes gates and bars are ascribed to it. It ought therefore, to be conceived of as a place, unless there be some decisive indication in the passage, where it occurs, to show that it is represented as a monster. Now in this passage we can find nothing which indicates such a figurative use of the term. On the contrary, whether the parallel word in the next line be translated *corruption*, or *pit*, it favors the supposition, that Sheol is represented as a place, and not as a rapacious monster.

Besides, if the figurative meaning of *Sheol*, contended for by Hengstenberg, be conceded, still the consideration of the train of thought which precedes the line, as well as the obvious meaning of the language, would require the sense to be, Thou wilt not *deliver me into* the power of Sheol, and not, Thou wilt not *suffer me to be retained by* this power.

We believe, therefore, that the true meaning of the line is, "Thou wilt not suffer me to be brought to the grave, or to a premature death, by the enemies which threaten me." This meaning is confirmed in my opinion, by a correct interpretation of the line which follows; "Nor wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see the pit."

The rendering "*holy one*" is one of the few instances, in which the common version departs from the received text, which is in the plural, קִדְּשֵׁי, *holy ones*. If the received text be correct, any particular application of the line to Jesus would of course be out of the question. The received text has the circumstance in its favor, that it is the more difficult reading, and is supported by the authority of the most distinguished critics. We cannot, however,

agree with De Wette, that it is more appropriate to the connexion. We think it less so, and for this reason chiefly are in favor of the various reading in the singular, supported, as it is, by manuscripts and versions. By *holy one*, we understand *me, who am devoted to thee*. See Ps. lxxxvi. 2.

But שחת should be translated *pit*, and not *corruption*. Hebrew usage is too clear on this point to admit of a doubt.

Thus, in Ps. xxx. 9 :

What will my blood profit thee, that I should go down to the pit ?

Here the same word שחת is used, and that it denotes a place, is evident from the verb *go down*, which is connected with it. It is to be observed that this psalm is ascribed to David, and with as great probability as the sixteenth.

The third verse of this psalm also deserves notice :

Thou hast raised me up from the grave [*Sheol*],

Thou hast kept me alive that I should not go down to *the pit*.

Here the word, parallel to *Sheol*, is not שחת, but בור, about the signification of which there is no question.

In Ps. xlix. 9, we have also an important instance of the use of the word שחת :

That he should live to eternity,

And not see *the pit*.

Here, from the contrast with the preceding line, it is evident that "to see the pit" means "to die," or be brought to the grave, and that this is the meaning, even if שחת be rendered *corruption*.

In Ps. vii. 15, we read, —

He made a pit [בור] and digged it,

And is fallen into the ditch, which he made.

Here, for want of a better synonym, שחת is rendered "ditch"; but that it denotes *a pit*, and not *corruption*, there can be no question.

שחת is also the word translated *pit* in the common version, in Job xxxiii. 24, 28, 30, and translated *grave*, in verse 22.

24 Deliver him from going down to *the pit*, &c.

28 He will deliver his soul [him] from going into *the pit*, &c.

30 To bring back his soul [him] from *the pit*, &c.

22 Yea, his soul [he] draweth near unto *the grave*.

See also Prov. xxvi. 27 ; Ezek. xix. 4, 8.

That שָׁחַת, therefore, being formed from שָׁחַ to *sink down*, commonly denotes *pit*, and is hence used to denote *Sheol* or the grave, seems to be indisputably settled by usage.

It has been maintained, however, that this word may be from שָׁחַת, *to destroy*, and hence denote *corruption* in the grave, and three verses are adduced as favorable to this supposition; Job xvii. 14; Ps. lv. 24, and Jer. xiii. 7. But the passage in Job may well be rendered thus:

I say to the pit, Thou art my father,
And to the worm, My sister, and my mother.

Thus the parallelism is sufficiently preserved, and surely it is highly probable that the word is used in the same sense as by the same author in xxxiii. 22, 24, 28, 30. As to the objection that שָׁחַת is in the feminine gender, it is well known that exactness is not observed in such cases by the Hebrew writers.

In Ps. lv. 24, we find שָׁחַת used in connexion with another noun signifying *pit*. לְקֵאֵר שָׁחַת. But it is not contrary to Hebrew usage to repeat synonymous nouns for the sake of emphasis. These words may therefore be rendered, —

Thou wilt bring them down to *the deepest pit*.

So Ps. xl. 3, טִיטַ הַחַיִּי, *clay of mire*, i. e. *miry clay*. Even if this idiom could not be supported, it would be more probable that one of the words was a gloss, than that שָׁחַת should be understood in a sense unauthorized by general usage.

Supposing, however, that שָׁחַת is, in the passage under consideration, derived from the verb signifying *to destroy*, and that we should translate the line, “Nor wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see destruction,” still it is to be remembered that this verb denotes *destruction* as of countries, cities, walls, nations, &c. and not *putrefaction*. See the Lexicons. We have reason to think that διαφθοράν in the Septuagint was understood in this general sense in this verse, as it certainly is in numerous other passages. The meaning will thus be, “Thou wilt not suffer thy holy one to be destroyed, to be put to a premature death by his enemies.” Jer. xiii. 7, is the only passage which *seems* to authorize the meaning *to putrefy*, or *to be dissolved*, as one of the senses of the verb שָׁחַת; but we see not why the general meaning of *destruction* will not apply to this verse, the assertion being, that the girdle of Jeremiah was destroyed, *ruined*.

But we have seen that the reasons for the rendering "*pit*" are overwhelming. We conclude, therefore, that we have translated the verse correctly, and that the meaning is, "Thou wilt not suffer me to come to a premature grave by the hands of my enemies."

The interpretation of the last verse depends upon that of the preceding part of the psalm. If we have rightly explained it, this verse will mean, "Thou wilt show me the means of preserving my life, or of obtaining deliverance and happiness; Thou hast in thy gift fulness of joy, and perpetual pleasures."

In a case, in which the meaning of the words is so well settled by Scripture usage, it is evident that tradition and authority are of little consequence. Ancient versions are of use to help us to the meaning of single words, when Scripture usage fails us. Of still less consequence are the opinions of the Fathers. We will not, therefore, undertake to give the history of the interpretation of this psalm. It is worth observing, however, that the most distinguished scholars, such as Hammond, Grotius, Le Clerc, Calvin, &c. suppose that David is the subject of the psalm throughout, and that it is only in a mystical sense, that it can be applied to Christ. The vast majority of critics have also been of opinion that the greater part of the psalm applies to David. In this, as in other cases, the advocates of a double sense are unbiassed judges of the primary meaning of a passage.

The contents, then, of the sixteenth psalm are as follows: The author and subject of it, probably David, prays for help, acknowledges his dependence upon God, expresses his hatred of idolatry, his satisfaction with the condition assigned him, his confidence in divine aid to deliver him from threatening calamity, and his hopes of future protection and favor. The death or resurrection of no person is expressed or implied in the psalm.

But we have admitted that Peter and Paul found the death and resurrection of Jesus in this psalm. Consequently we admit that they were in an error. And if so in this case, they may be so in other cases where they have used the language of the Old Testament.

Human reason must necessarily be the interpreter of the Bible. If this reason, exercised in subjection to established

laws of interpretation, bring us to conclusions different from those to which the Apostles arrived, we cannot give them up without undermining the authority of Revelation. For how do we know that we understand the meaning of any interpretation of a passage by the Apostles? How do we know, for instance, that the Apostles Peter and Paul supposed Jesus to be referred to in the sixteenth psalm? How, but by the exercise of our reason? We have admitted, what some have denied, that these Apostles did understand the psalm, as above stated. But we are not more confident of it, than we are that our own interpretation of the psalm is correct. We must bid defiance to more numerous and weighty reasons, in order to make that psalm apply to any one but David, or one of his age, than in denying that Peter or Paul supposed Jesus to be the subject of any part of the psalm.

The truth is, that the Evangelists and Apostles never claimed to be inspired reasoners and interpreters. Where is the passage, in which they say, "This interpretation is true. I know it by miraculous inspiration"? They *reason* with their hearers in the mode prevailing at the time, as in the case of the psalm abovementioned, and thus refer the matter to the tribunal of common sense. Their arguments are not conclusive to us, because the state of opinion in the nineteenth century is different from what was the state of opinion in the Apostolic age. The Jews of that age had no correct views of the nature of language, or the principles of interpretation, as has been mentioned before. The Apostles partook of the errors and prejudices of their age in things in which Christ had not instructed them. There is no evidence, nor any color of reason for the supposition, that, when Christian truth was poured into their minds, all their previous notions and prejudices were poured out. Long after the ascension of Jesus and the day of Pentecost, a miracle was necessary to convince the Apostle Peter, that gentiles as well as Jews were to be admitted to the privileges of Christianity. Neither can we perceive any advantage to be derived from the Apostles' being inspired as reasoners and interpreters, unless their hearers had also been inspired with sound principles of logic and interpretation. That some of the interpretations of the Apostles are incorrect, and some of their

reasonings inconclusive, only proves, therefore, that they were not inspired in matters, in which inspiration would have been of no use. They might be perfectly competent, nay, supernaturally aided, to preach and record the doctrines of Jesus, and the facts concerning his life, death, and resurrection, and yet be left to their own resources to maintain and recommend those truths, and call attention to those facts.

They may have endeavoured to do away Jewish prejudices by reasoning on Jewish principles from books held sacred by the Jews, when, if they had been addressing Athenians, they would have contented themselves with the proof of the facts on which Christianity is founded. They may have been taught of God in regard to the essential truths of Christianity, and yet not be infallible in all the means, which they used for recommending those truths to their hearers. If they have alleged proof of the divine authority of Jesus satisfactory to ourselves, we need not be concerned, if some of their arguments, used for the same purpose, are conclusive only on suppositions, and according to modes of interpretation, which we do not adopt in common with their Jewish hearers. The essential doctrines of Christianity are eternal truth for all men in all ages. The means used by the sacred writers for recommending and maintaining them are adapted to the circumstances and modes of thinking of their own age. We see not why they should have been inspired as reasoners and interpreters, rather than their successors from that time to this.

It appears to us that Christianity has suffered much from the connection with its defence, of propositions, which are untenable. The commonly received doctrine of the inspiration of all the writings included in the Bible, is a millstone hung round its neck, sufficient to sink it. That Christianity has been able to sustain, not only itself, but the mighty mass of errors, which have been connected with it, from the time of the Judaizing Christians to the present day, is a fact which speaks strongly of the strength of its evidence. But, the time has come, when the religion of Christ must be separated from extraneous and doubtful propositions, in order to be sustained. The objections to Christianity, which are now most common, arise from certain false views of the character and use of the Scriptures. They are

brought, not so much against the evidence of Revelation as being defective, as against the credibility of what is alleged to be the revelation. Men hear the Bible constantly represented as the word of God ; and yet they know that it contains much which is not the word of God. Their objections fall to the ground, when the true character and use of the Scriptures are explained ; when the distinction is pointed out between the revelation itself, or the word of God, and the records of this revelation, the history of those to whom it was made, the accounts of its propagation, and the various arguments used by its early advocates for its defence and recommendation. It is true, that the Bible contains the word of God. It contains also many things which have no claim to that appellation. It contains probably all that could be collected, at a certain period, of the literature of the Hebrews, their history, poetry, ethics. Besides the word of God, it contains the words of many wicked men. It contains some unwarrantable language from the lips of pious men, such as Job,* the Psalmists,† and Jeremiah.‡ The early history of the Jews enters sometimes into disgusting details, unsuited to the taste and moral feeling of the present age. The New Testament contains histories of the life and discourses of our Divine Teacher, the acts and teachings of his Apostles, and various letters argumentative and hortatory, instructive in all ages, but specially adapted to the circumstances of the early Christians. Now when you call the contents of this whole collection of writings the word of God, or divine revelation, you assert a proposition, which is not true, and which is a stumblingblock to thousands. The divine authority of Christ can be maintained. The truth of his doctrines and the obligation of his precepts rest on a foundation which cannot be shaken. They are worthy of God, and come from one whose authority was established by miracles. The correctness of all the reasonings, sentiments, and statements contained in the Bible is by no means an essential part of the belief of a Christian. The important distinction is to be made between the word of God, or the essential doctrines of Revelation, and the writings which contain it, or the various means used, by those

* See Job, Ch. iii.

† Jer. xviii. 21 - 23.

‡ Ps. lxix. cix. cxxxvii.

to whom it was communicated, to transmit, defend, and recommend it.*

But to return to our subject ; we differ, as has been seen, from most of those who have replied to Collins. We concede that the Evangelists and Apostles have misunderstood and misapplied certain passages of the Old Testament, but maintain that the divinity of Christianity is not affected by these errors. We believe, too, that many of the passages of the Old Testament, which are applied to the circumstances of our Saviour's life, are only so applied for the purpose of rhetorical illustration, or in the way of argument *ex concessis*, or *ad hominem*.

One point more remains to be considered, viz. the use made of the Old Testament by Jesus himself. In what sense did he claim to be the Messiah, and in what sense did he suppose that any passages in the Old Testament were fulfilled in him ?

We remark first, that there is a necessary peculiarity in the language of Jesus arising from the circumstance that he was the founder of a new religion ; that he was sent to introduce a new and more spiritual dispensation, and to abolish the peculiarities of Judaism. Now in introducing the new ideas relating to the Christian dispensation, he must either make a new language, or endeavour to connect new ideas with old terms, then in use among the Jews. This latter was evidently the method of Jesus, not only in relation to the subject under consideration, but to other subjects.†

When he began to teach, he found that a temporal deliverer and king was expected by the Jews, called by them "the Messiah," "the Son of God," &c., and the phrases "kingdom of God," "kingdom of heaven," &c. in use to denote the reign of this great king. He found the Jews expecting a new dispensation, but of a temporal character, to be introduced by the Messiah, as their final deliverer. Now it is remarkable, that Jesus nowhere tells the Jews, or even his own disciples, expressly, — "Ye are not to expect a king ;

* On this subject see a useful dissertation by J. A. H. Tittmann, — *De discrimine disciplinæ Christi et Apostolorum*, in the *Commentationes Theologicæ*, published by Rosenmueller, Maurer, &c.

† See the very valuable remarks in Norton's "Statement of Reasons," &c. pp. 211, 212, and from 313 to the end.

your hopes of an earthly kingdom are wholly unfounded." See his answer to James and John, Matt. xx. 23, and to others after his resurrection, Acts i. 7. His method was to use the language respecting the Messiah and his kingdom then in use, and by subsequent, gradual, and indirect explanation to remove the ideas, which the Jews attached to that language, and to substitute his own. This method must be regarded, not as giving his interpretation of the language of the Prophets, but only as using that kind of language, as a means of introducing his doctrines, and establishing his claims, as a divine teacher.

We know that Jesus was not a king, according to the received use of language, — in the sense, which the Prophets seem to attach to the word when they announce the coming of a Messiah. He came as a religious teacher, appealing to the understanding and heart, and resisted every temptation to the assumption of political power.

He yet claimed to be a king in some sense, and to be the Messiah in some sense. And he has not left us to doubt in what sense he understood his claim. Very remarkable and satisfactory in regard to this point is his language before Pilate, John xviii. 37. "Pilate said to him, 'So thou art a king then?' Jesus answered, 'Yes, I am a king. For this end was I born, and for this end came I into the world, *that I might bear witness to the truth*. Every one, who is on the side of truth, *heareth my voice*,'" that is, obeys me. Here he evidently explained to Pilate, that he claimed to be a king in the sense of being an extraordinary promulgator of the truth; in being the authoritative guide of all who are led by the love of the truth to listen to his voice, and obey him. We may, therefore, suppose that he assumed the title of Messiah in a similar sense, and that, when he affirmed that he was the Messiah, he only affirmed in figurative language, that he was the inspired teacher from God, for whose instructions the Jewish dispensation had been a preparation, and who was designed by God to fulfill his great purposes in relation to the instruction of the Jewish nation and of the world.

In John xviii. 36, Jesus says, "My kingdom is not of this world"; i. e. it is not a political, but a spiritual kingdom; not a temporal sovereignty, for then would my subjects fight, like the subjects of temporal kings.

In Luke xvii. 20, 21, we have another important illustration of the sense in which our Saviour understood his claims to be a king, or the Messiah. "The coming of the kingdom of God is not to be observed; nor will men say, Behold it is here, or, Behold, it is there! *for behold the kingdom of God is within you.*"* We need not remark, how well this accords with his language to Pilate.

In Mat. xvi. 28, he says, "I tell you in truth, there are some of those standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming to reign;" i. e. till they shall know that his religion is securely established; as appears from a comparison of this passage with that last quoted, and with fact. By the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the question between Jesus and the Jews in regard to his religion was in some measure decided, and the greatest obstacle to the propagation of it removed.

In John xiii. 31, he says, "Now is the Son of man glorified," i. e. by his death, which was to be the principal means of establishing his religion in the world. See also Mat. xviii. 1 — 4. xix. 28. Luke xxii. 29. †

It appears to us evident from the preceding passages, that the principal idea, which Jesus attached to the kingdom, which he professed to set up, was the dominion of truth and duty in the minds of men. This kingdom commenced, when a single follower received his religion in a proper manner. And when he speaks of coming to reign at a future time, as in Mat. xvi. 28, he refers to the greater progress of what was already begun, the extensive acknowledgment of what was generally denied. Jesus claimed to be a king, when he stood a prisoner before Pilate. It is true, however, that the happy consequences, in this world and the future, of a reception of the truth and obedience of the precepts of Jesus, are sometimes included in the meaning of the kingdom of God.

But, should we suppose with some writers, that the kingdom of Christ refers principally to his state of exaltation after his resurrection from the dead, we do not see that the language of the Prophets is more literally fulfilled in him, than on the preceding supposition. Whatever may be the in-

* Norton's Translation, as given in his Statement of Reasons, &c.

† See Hammond, *ad loc.*

visible reign of Christ in heaven, it certainly does not correspond to the glorious reign of a temporal king on earth, as it is set forth by the Hebrew prophets. Whatever agency Jesus may now exercise in the government of the world, all will allow that it affects only the willing soul, and is not a government of force like that of temporal sovereigns.

The evidence, which our Saviour adduces to support his claims, seems to show that he claimed to be a king, or the Messiah, in the sense of being sanctified and sent into the world to be the revealer of God's character and will. This is the ground, which he himself assigns for the assumption of one of the titles of the Messiah. "Say ye of him, whom the Father *sanctified and sent* into the world, 'Thou blasphemest,' because I said, 'I am the son of God'? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him."

So John x. 24, 25. "'If thou be the Messiah, tell us plainly.' Jesus answered them, 'I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me.'" Now miracles prove Jesus to be the Messiah, only in the general sense above mentioned. To show that he corresponded to a particular person or character predicted in the Old Testament, passages from the Old Testament, and not miracles would have been the appropriate evidence.

John v. 36. "The works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father sent me." Thus Jesus makes it his great aim to prove that he was a divine messenger, and thus, that his doctrines were true, and his precepts obligatory.

By using the language relating to the Messiah and his kingdom as the vehicle for announcing his claims, Jesus virtually denied, that any future messenger from God was to appear to the Jews. This language conveys the idea, that he was the last messenger of God to the nation; the agent, whose office it was to close the ancient, and introduce a new economy.

Whether, as a person, he be the subject of prophecy or not, he was sent by God to accomplish purposes, which the Hebrew prophets supposed would be accomplished by a Messiah, to promote the knowledge of God, and produce peace and good will among men. He came to introduce a

spiritual dispensation in place of one, which had led the souls of prophets and righteous men to long for a better. He was the end of the law for righteousness. He might, therefore, assume the character of Messiah, though he had not been the subject of miraculous prediction. He was *anointed* with the holy spirit and with power to accomplish the best purposes, which the prophets supposed would be accomplished by a Messiah, though he came not arrayed in the robes of royalty, as their imaginations had represented him; though his religion was established in the world, by the destruction, rather than by the prosperity and glory of the Jewish nation; and though he completed his work by martyrdom, and not by victory.

But can the particular quotations, made by Jesus from the Old Testament, be reconciled with the preceding views?

Some of the more difficult passages of this kind, Luke xxiv. 25—27, 44—48; Mat. xxii. 41—45; John xvii. 12, are explained in the *Christian Examiner*, Vol. V. pp. 55, 56. There are no other passages, which present any greater difficulty than those. See John xiii. 18; Mat. xxvi. 31, 54; Mark ix. 12, xii. 10; John vii. 38, xv. 25. Some of these are plain instances of the use of Scripture language merely to express what happened to Jesus, without supposition, on the part of the writer, of its miraculous fulfillment.

Mat. xxvi. 24; Mark xiv. 21; Luke xxii. 22; are worthy of notice, as showing, that we cannot feel sure that we have the exact words of Jesus, in relation to the subject. Matthew and Mark say, "The son of man, indeed, goeth," i. e. dieth, "as it is *written* of him." But Luke has it, "And truly the son of man goeth, *as it was determined*;" κατὰ τὸ ὁρισμένον. Corresponding to this, is the language of Peter; "Him being delivered by the determined counsel and foreknowledge of God." That Luke has conveyed to us the views of Jesus in his references to the Old Testament, is highly probable. He meant to convey the idea, that his death and sufferings were not accidental, and were not evidence of the failure of his mission, but were rather appointed of God as the means of fulfilling his mission, and completing the plan of Providence, which was partially unfolded in the Jewish dispensation, and partially accomplished by the sufferings of previous prophets. Hence, in the near view of his

sufferings and death, he could make the sublime exclamation, "Now is the Son of man glorified."

But we must close. We have omitted many topics relating to the subject, and only glanced at others. It is a subject for a volume, rather than for the pages of a review. We trust that we have done something to facilitate the inquiries of others into the subject. We hope that the labors of some of our theologians may be directed to it. We should be as glad to have our views refuted, as to have them confirmed, provided some more tenable and satisfactory theory can be substituted in their place. Having come to the conclusion, that the language of the Prophets, in the sense which we have reason to suppose that they assigned to it, gives us no intimations of a suffering, dying Messiah, or one who should rise from the dead, and no clear and proper predictions which were fulfilled in Jesus personally, we have endeavoured to suggest views tending to reconcile this fact with the language of Jesus, and the authority of the Christian revelation. If there be any better way of explaining the subject without violence to established principles of interpretation in the explanation of the Old Testament, and without supposing that Jesus understood passages in the Old Testament in a mystical sense, we should be glad to know it.

Theories like that of Hengstenberg, or of the advocates of a double sense, will not stand the scrutinizing logic of the present age. We have labored and prayed, that we might arrive at the truth on the subject. Let the same principles and rules of interpretation be applied to the Old Testament, which are applied to all other books, and, if better views can be presented in regard to its relation to the facts and reasonings in the New, we should rejoice to see them.

"Si quid novisti rectius istis
Candidus imperti; si non, his utere mecum."

ART. IV. — *The Life of FRIEDRICH SCHILLER, comprehending an Examination of his Works.* From the London edition. Boston. Carter, Hendee, & Co. 1833. 12mo. pp. 294.

HE who is called to be a prophet in his generation, — whose office it is to unfold new forms of truth and beauty, — enjoys, among other prerogatives peculiar to his calling, the privilege of a two-fold life. He is at once a dweller in the dust, and a denizen of that land where all truth and beauty spring. The genius that is linked with him, has its own world, and his earthly fortunes are chiefly memorable as the conditions of its developement, or as the fruits of its action. While his mortal part, according to necessary and everlasting laws, fulfills its destiny in the great circle of Nature, the free spirit labors joyfully in that invisible kingdom to whose service it has been called. Ofttimes, however, the mortal and the spiritual, the earthly calling and the high calling, the prophet and the man, are so interwoven, that it becomes almost impossible to distinguish the one from the other. Hence the biography of such an one, when conceived in the spirit of this double nature, is a task of peculiar difficulty. The biographer must not only exhibit each part of his subject in its individual distinctness and fulness, but he must also explain the relation between them; he must show how the intellectual life has sprung from the earthly condition, and how the earthly condition has in turn been modified by the intellectual life. Now it is evident, that none but an *auto-biography* can fully satisfy the conditions of such a problem, inasmuch as the whole mystery of the connexion between the mortal and the spiritual, can be known only to individual consciousness. But so far as it is possible for one mind to interpret another, — so far as it is possible for the disciple of one nation or literature to comprehend and exhibit the intellectual offspring of a different nation and literature, so far this object has been accomplished in the work before us. The “Biography of Schiller” is a production of no ordinary merit, from whatever point of view we regard it; to us, it is chiefly remarkable as one of the very few instances in which full justice has been rendered by an English mind, to the character and claims of a foreign

writer. Exclusiveness has been ever the besetting sin of that nation. Possessing a literature of their own, unequalled since the Greek, they seem never to have dreamed that any thing could be gained by a free intercourse with the genius of other climes. And yet there is no literature so rich, but it may be improved by grafts of foreign growth. The Germans have acted in this respect more liberally and more wisely. By means of translations, which seem rather to reproduce, than to interpret their respective originals, these indefatigable cultivators have succeeded in naturalizing the choice products of every zone. Their late luxuriant harvest of native produce has been rendered more luxuriant still, by a matchless collection of exotics; and an acquaintance with the German has now become an introduction to all that is beautiful and good of every age and clime.

The "Life of Schiller" is distinguished by its clear and happy method, its luminous critiques, and its just appreciation of the characteristic excellences and deficiencies of the poet whom it portrays. From scanty materials the author has constructed a work full of instruction, and pregnant with more than romantic interest. A life unusually barren of vicissitude, is made to appear eventful in the strong light which is thrown upon the revolutions of a master mind. In short, this biography is what the biography of a poet should always be,—the history of a mind rather than the history of a person, a record of thoughts and feelings rather than of events, a faithful exposition of the struggles and vicissitudes, the trials and the triumphs, which have befallen a human intellect in the service of truth.

The few literary faults, which an impartial critic might discover, have arisen almost entirely from the want of a sufficient acquaintance with the German idiom. The author's translations are for the most part excellent; occasionally, however, a misapprehension of some word or phrase has betrayed him into errors, which sometimes distort, but oftener weaken the original. The most important of these errors have been pointed out and judiciously corrected by the American editor; the few that remain are, comparatively, trifling. In some instances they seem to be wilful deviations from, rather than misapprehensions of the poet's meaning.

Not to dwell, however, on these *literary* imperfections, there is one portion of this work, — we rejoice to say *only* one, —

of which we feel ourselves constrained to express a decided disapprobation. We allude to the manner in which our author mentions Schiller's use of stimulants. This practice, he seems to regard, as not only innocent, but praiseworthy ; the evils, which sprung from it, — the enfeebling of the bodily frame and the shortening of life, are represented as noble sacrifices to the cause of letters. "It was an error so to waste his strength ; but one of those, which increase rather than diminish our respect ; originating, as it did, in generous ardor for what was best and grandest, they must be cold censurers, that can condemn it harshly. For ourselves, we lament, but honor this excess of zeal ; its effects were mournful, but its origin was noble." We believe that much mischief is done by such representations, or, indeed, by any exposure of similar practices on the part of distinguished men. Young aspirants after literary eminence are led, by the hearing of such things, to believe that there is some essential connexion between the faults and the fame of the great, and that the one will necessarily lead to the other. We have seen effects of this kind produced in more than one instance by Byron's reported eulogy of gin. It is much to be regretted, that poets should ever resort to other sources of inspiration than the natural fountains of their own spiritual being ; but, if such things be, let them be buried and forgotten. The biographer is bound by no obligation that we can understand, to reveal these secrets of the fleshly prison-house ; if he must reveal them, let it not be in the spirit of commendation, but with the rebuke which the error deserves.

We shall not dwell any longer on this part of our subject. Indeed our purpose in taking up this work, was not to discuss the merits of the biography. We wish to speak of the illustrious poet whose memory it is designed to honor.

The name of Friedrich Schiller has been honorably known to the literary world for half a century. Nearly thirty years have elapsed since his decease, yet the memory of his poetic achievements is as fresh in the minds of his countrymen as if he had died but yesterday. A more brilliant fame has seldom fallen to the lot of any poet ; and never did poet struggle more faithfully to win it. He was not one of those for whom fortune prepares the way, and whose paths are made straight by the machinery of circumstances ; he belongs to that noble army who have raised

themselves to the summit of humanity with no other machinery than the buoyancy of their own genius. Born in poverty, bred in obscurity, bound to an institution which warred with every natural expression of the soul and delighted in torturing all minds into one mould, trained to a profession which deals emphatically with the flesh, — the world was all against him. But he had a soul that could overcome the world. Let those who are accustomed to derive every manifestation of the mind from outward circumstances explain, if they can, the phenomenon of a poem originating under such circumstances as these. Yet, it was while thus circumstanced, at the age of eighteen, that Schiller produced the *Robbers*. Our biographer says ; “ There seems no doubt that but for so mean a cause as the perverted discipline of the Stuttgart school, we had never seen this tragedy.” We cannot agree with him. Schiller’s sufferings at Stuttgart may have furnished the coloring of this drama ; but, without the inborn spirit of poesy that possessed him, all the discipline in the world would not have produced it. Where that spirit is, it *will* speak. In Schiller it spoke the louder no doubt, for the restraints which opposed it. Its first accents were strong and terrible. It spoke with an angry scream, which pierced every soul from the Rhine to the Baltic, and startled the eagles of dominion on their ancient sceptres. Such a voice had never been heard in Germany since Luther called her from the bondage of Rome. It was a prophecy of that tempest which soon after burst upon Europe and changed the face of empires. A true image of man, as he exists in his native strength and majesty, undisguised by old conventions, was held up to the world, and tyrants trembled as they gazed. Germany was soon filled with the fame of “ The Robbers.” It went into every circle, and for a time supplanted every other work. The Sorrows of Werter were forgotten in the agonies of Moor, and *Götz with the iron hand*, the hero of history, dwindled into insignificance before this giant-child of the imagination.

The class of writings, to which this work belongs, is peculiar, we believe, to modern times. It is characterized by a spirit of fierce disquietude, a dissatisfaction with the whole mechanism of society, and a presumptuous questioning of all that God or man has ordained. It represents a state of being which no word or combination of words can exactly express ; a disease peculiar to ardent natures, in early life :

“ The flash and outbreak of a fiery mind ;
A savageness of unreclaimed blood ; ”

a keen sensibility to all that is absurd and oppressive in social life, a scorning of authority and custom, a feeling that all the uses of this world are weary and unprofitable, together with the consciousness of high powers, bright visions of ideal excellence, and a restless yearning after things not granted to man. To those who are not acquainted with German works of this description, Shelley's and Byron's poetry may serve as English samples. “ *The Robbers* ” is, on the whole, the most innocent work of the kind to which it belongs. Heinse's “ *Ardinghello*,” a contemporary production of the same class, is a very impure book, the tendency of “ *Werter* ” is questionable, and that of “ *Faust* ” still more so ; but Schiller's drama, we will venture to affirm, never did injury to the morals of any one. The allegation that young men have been made highwaymen by it, is unsupported by any evidence that we have been able to discover. It seems to us just about as probable that “ *The Robbers* ” should produce this effect, as that any one should be induced by one of Cooper's novels to join a tribe of Indians. Our author has said with truth, that the publication of “ *The Robbers* ” forms an era in the literature of the world. With the exception of “ *Faust*,” we know of no work since Shakspeare, that possesses half its power ; we mean that kind of power which is evinced by fertility of imagination, and by vivid expression of passionate emotions. In this latter respect, “ *The Robbers* ” exceeds every thing of the kind. “ *The Corsair* ” and “ *The Giaour* ” are pastoral eclogues compared with it. The play has innumerable faults, it is objectionable throughout in point of manner, it abounds in puerilities and in violations of the most obvious rules of taste ; and yet, with all these deductions, it still remains, in our estimation, the most effective of Schiller's works, and it seems to us, that the promise implied in this early effort was never fully realized. In expressing this opinion we do not mean to contradict the German critics and Schiller himself, who agree in condemning “ *The Robbers* ” for its juvenile extravagance. We agree with them that the author's later works, beginning with “ *Don Carlos*,” are far preferable as finished specimens of art ; they evince a greater reach of thought, clearer judgment, maturer views of nature and life,

and a better acquaintance with the rules, the limits, and the true objects of art. But the genuine power of genius is far less strongly impressed upon these later works; not one of them possesses the glow and the strength, which characterize this singular production. This stands alone in the literary history of its author and of the age to which it belongs. We have translated the following passage, not because we think it the most striking in this play, but because among those that *are* striking, it is less frequently quoted than many others. It is the dream of Franz von Moor, the parricide, related to an aged servant whom he had a short time before commissioned to murder his brother. He feels that a life of atrocious villany is about drawing to its close, and the furies of a guilty conscience begin to lay hold upon him.

“*Franz.* Stay! Sit down on this sofa beside me! so, — you are a wise man, a good man! Now let me relate to you.

“*Daniel.* Not now, another time! Let me put you to bed, rest is better for you.

“*Franz.* No, I beg of you, let me tell you, and then laugh heartily at me! D’ye see, I dreamed I had given a sumptuous entertainment, my heart was full of good cheer, and I lay overcome with wine on a plot of grass in my castle garden. Suddenly, — it was the hour of noon, — suddenly — but promise to laugh at me!

“*Daniel.* Suddenly?

“*Franz.* Suddenly an enormous clap of thunder struck my slumbering ear. I started, trembling, to my feet, and behold it appeared to me that the whole horizon was flaming and blazing with living fire; mountains, woods, and cities were melting like wax in the furnace; and a howling tempest swept away sea, sky, and earth. And a voice sounded as from a brazen trumpet: ‘Earth, give up thy dead! Sea, give up thy dead!’ And immediately the naked fields began to bring forth and to cast up skulls, and ribs, and bones, which formed themselves into human bodies, and streamed along in countless numbers, a living storm. Then I looked upward, and behold I stood at the foot of thundering Sinai, and above and around me it swarmed with life, and on the summit of the mountain, upon three fiery thrones, sat three men before whose countenance the creature fled.

“*Daniel.* Why, that is an exact picture of the judgment-day.

“*Franz.* Ridiculous stuff, is it not? Then one of the three came forward; his presence was like the starry night, and he

had in his hand an iron seal, and he held it between morning and evening, and said: 'For ever holy, just, and true. There is but *one* Truth, there is but *one* Virtue! Woe, woe, woe to the worm that doubteth!' Then the second came forward. He had in his hand a polished mirror, and he held it between morning and evening, and said: 'This mirror is truth, hypocrisy and lies cannot stand before it.' Then I, and they who were with me, started, for we saw serpent and tiger faces reflected from that dread mirror. Then the third came forward. He had in his hand a brazen scale, and he held it between morning and evening, and said: 'Draw near, ye children of Adam! I weigh the thoughts of men in the scale of mine anger, and their deeds in the balance of my wrath!'

"*Daniel.* God be merciful!

"*Franz.* We all stood pale as snow, and anxious expectation throbbed in every breast. Then I thought I heard my name called first from amid the thunders of the mount, and my innermost marrow froze within me, and my teeth chattered aloud. And immediately the scales began to sound, and the rock thundered, and the Hours went by. One by one, they passed by the scale on the left hand, and each one, as it passed, threw in a damning sin.

"*Daniel.* May God forgive you!

"*Franz.* He did not. The scale on the left hand grew to a mountain, but the other, filled with the blood of the atonement, held it still poised in air. At last there came an old man bowed down with sorrow, his arm gnawed by raging hunger; all eyes turned toward him, I knew him well. And he severed a lock from his silver hair and threw it into the scale of transgressions, and behold it sank suddenly to the bottom, and the scale of redemption rose to the sky. Then I heard a voice from amid the smoke, saying: 'Mercy, mercy to every sinner on earth and in hell. Thou only art rejected.' (*Deep pause.*) Well, why don't you laugh?"

The scene in which Karl von Moor discovers his aged father in the dungeon of an old tower, where he had been left to die with hunger by his younger son, has been much and justly celebrated. The following tribute is paid to it by an English poet.

"Schiller! that hour I would have wished to die
If through the shuddering midnight I had sent,
From the dark dungeon of the tower time-rent,
That fearful voice, a famished father's cry,

Lest in some after moment aught more mean
Might stamp me mortal ! A triumphant shout
Black horror screamed, and all her goblin rout
Diminished shrunk from the more withering scene." *

It is certainly the sublimest conception in all Schiller's writings, and one of the sublimest in the whole compass of poetry. Were there nothing else, this alone would be sufficient to give "The Robbers" the preëminence we have ventured to claim for it as an exhibition of imaginative power. In every other respect it is surpassed by most of the author's later works. These differ much in character and in merit. "The Conspiracy of Fiesco" has nearly all the faults of "The Robbers" with none of its redeeming strength. This play moreover is rendered offensive to the reader by an unnecessary display of dramatic machinery. The list of persons in the outset is furnished with stage directions, showing how each character is to look, speak, and behave; and scarcely a speech of any importance occurs throughout the whole piece without an accompanying parenthetical notice, acquainting us with the tone and look with which it is uttered; as, for example:

"*Leonora, (with a look that says much.)* From my anger you have nothing to fear."

"*Leonora, (with a sarcastic expression.)* Love?"

"*Fiesco. Come hither, painter. (Very proud and with dignity,)* You make republics free with your pencil, but cannot break your own chains. (*Full and commanding,*) Go! your work is deception. Let the appearance yield to the reality. (*With greatness, throwing down the picture,*) I HAVE DONE what you have only painted."

Such directions betray a weakness in the author, who ought to make his language tell its own story. When a poet resorts to such measures, and, instead of satisfying the claims of the reader from the resources of his own genius, "puts him off with an order on the player,"† he confesses himself unequal to the task he has undertaken. The actor too, we suspect, is more perplexed than aided by such instructions. How, for example, is he to demean himself when directed to appear great? He must *be* great indeed, if he does not appear

* Coleridge. Sonnet to the author of "The Robbers."

† Schlegel.

ridiculous in the attempt. *Σὺ μακρόν οὐ μέγαν ποιεῖς*, "You make yourself long instead of great," was said to an ancient mimic, who, being required to express in gesture the greatness of Agamemnon, raised himself on tiptoe. The modern actor, when burdened with a like demand, would be apt, we fancy, to commit a similar blunder, and incur a similar reproach.

"*Kabale und Liebe*" ("Intrigue and Love") is a clever production, but it is one which might have proceeded from a pen less able than Schiller's. "*Don Carlos*" is distinguished by a majesty and a pathos which command our admiration in spite of criticism. The principal faults and the chief excellences of this piece lie near together. The Marquis Posa, the most distinguished personage in the play, is certainly a splendid creation, but hardly a fit subject for the drama. He is too ideal for that species of composition,* and too great for the subordinate station which he occupies. Carlos is the intended hero of the piece, but he is overshadowed by the heroism of Posa, and that heroism is of too ethereal a nature to be made a topic of secondary interest, — a part of the machinery employed in developing a plot. We are dazzled with the splendor of the Marquis's sacrifice, but cannot help feeling that the sacrifice is out of all proportion to its object, and are half inclined to agree with the Queen when she tells him, "You have rushed upon this act which you call sublime. Deny it not. You have long thirsted for it. Though thousand hearts should break, it moves you not, so you gratify your pride. You are seeking admiration only." Besides, Posa is meant to interest us by the purity of his moral character; yet the act by which he incurs Philip's displeasure, is a decided immorality, revolting to every pure mind, and unjustifiable by any theory of morals that was ever framed. The interview between the King and the chief Inquisitor is striking beyond any thing of the kind that we have ever met with. The stubborn pride, the inexorable tyranny of Castilian majesty, and the dread power of the Romish church, are personified in these two men. The revolutionary spirit of Carlos, and a desire to be revenged on Posa, have determined the King to deliver his son into the hands of the Inquisition. "Can

* Schiller has endeavoured to answer this objection in his letters on "*Don Carlos*," but, as it appears to us, without success.

you," he asks the aged chief of that tribunal, "can you establish for me a new faith which shall justify the bloody murder of a child? *Inquis.* To satisfy eternal justice the Son of God died on the tree. *King.* Will you engage to propagate this opinion throughout Europe? *Inquis.* Wherever the cross is worshipped. *King.* I shall sin against nature; can you also silence her mighty voice? *Inquis.* In matters of faith, nature has no voice. *King.* I resign my office into your hands. Am I free to withdraw? *Inquis.* Give him up to me. *King.* He is my only son; if I lose him, for whom have I gathered? *Inquis.* Better have gathered for *corruption* than for *liberty*."

The discrepancy between the Carlos of history and the Carlos of Schiller, is a fault which may well be pardoned for the beauty of the illusion which we owe to it.

"Maria Stuart" has fewer admirers than most of Schiller's plays. Perhaps the want of success in this drama arises from the undramatic nature of its subject. It is the office of tragedy to represent human action in conflict with human destiny. Whether the action be that of a strong passion within the soul, as in the case of Lear and of Othello, or whether it be an agency exerted upon outward objects, as in the case of Macbeth, strong action, of some kind or other, the hero of a tragedy must exhibit, and, above all, the decisive act to which he falls a victim at last, must proceed from himself.* But Mary Stuart is passive throughout this play. Her conduct towards Elizabeth does not deserve the name of dramatic action, nor does any thing else which proceeds from her in the course of the piece; and therefore, though interesting as a picture of patient suffering, she wants that kind of interest which belongs to the heroine of a tragedy.

"Wilhelm Tell" has no faults and great beauties, but it

* There are some dramatic works of acknowledged excellence which may seem to be exceptions to this rule. In the "Prometheus" of Æschylus, for example, it is *suffering* and not *action* which constitutes the main interest of the piece; but it is a suffering incurred by the voluntary *act* of the sufferer: for, though no such act is exhibited in this drama, yet as there is reason to suppose that the play constituted originally a portion of a *trilogy*; it is probable that the part preceding this, contained the act of which the sufferings in question are the consequence.

wants the glow and the life necessary to produce a strong impression. The most successful of Schiller's plays is "The Maid of Orleans." This has not indeed the fiery strength of "The Robbers," but it has beauties which "The Robbers" has not, while it is free from the faults with which that play abounds. Nor is there any want of strength ; it is no longer indeed the rude vigor of undisciplined youth, but a vigor chastened by union with other elements, and reconciled with that sweetness and dignity which befit the higher provinces of creative art. "The Maid of Orleans" is an exquisitely finished work ; its author has contrived to spread over it a magic harmony of coloring which softens without weakening the living energy that pervades it. The womanhood of Joanna is admirably preserved. In all those scenes of strife and slaughter with which the presence and agency of woman seem most irreconcilable, she never appears monstrous, or out of place. Her zeal and courage have not unsexed her. The warlike sternness of her nature is most happily blended with feminine grace. With equal skill, the poet has contrived to maintain the prophetic character, which the Maid claims from the beginning, and on which the movement of the piece mainly depends. Her inspiration is not a thing assumed for the nonce, but a part of her being, the natural expression of her pure and lofty soul. The soliloquy in which she takes leave of her favorite haunts, and declares her mission, furnishes a lively picture of the state of her feelings and expectations, when on the eve of quitting her native village. The original is in rhymed stanzas, of which we give the following translation.

"Farewell, ye mountains, ye beloved pastures !
Ye silent, peaceful valleys, fare ye well !
Joanna shall roam over you no more,
Joanna bids you evermore farewell.
Ye meadows that I watered, and ye trees
That I have planted, flourish gladly still !
Farewell, ye grottoes, and ye cooling springs !
Thou Echo, gentle voice of this fair vale,
Who oft hast answer given unto my songs,
Joanna goes and never will return.

Disperse ye lambs upon the heath !
Ye are a flock without a shepherd now ;

For I another herd am called to tend
On yonder blood-stained field of peril ;
So hath the Spirit's voice instructed me,
It is no earthly call that draws me hence.

For he, who from the burning bush of old,
Appeared to Moses upon Horeb's height,
And there in Pharaoh's presence bade him stand,
He, who elected Jesse's godlike son,
The shepherd-boy, to be his champion,
Who ever hath to shepherds gracious been, —
He spake to me, his handmaid, from this tree,
'Go ! thou art sent to testify of me.

In iron shalt thou case thy youthful limbs,
With polished steel thy tender form enclose,
Never may mortal love within thy heart
Enkindle earthly passion's vain desire ;
Never shall bridal wreath adorn thy locks,
Nor infant bloom upon thy virgin breast ;
But I will crown thee with heroic fame,
And all earth's daughters shall revere thy name.

For when in battle France's courage quails,
And ruin threatens this devoted land,
Then shalt thou bear my sacred oriflame,
And, like the harvest in the reaper's hand,
The conqueror shall fall before thy sword,
Thou shalt reverse the tide of his success,
To France's warlike sons salvation bring,
Deliver Reims, and crown thy country's king.'

A sign from Heaven hath been vouchsafed to me ;
This helmet God hath sent, it comes from him,
Its touch inspires me with a power divine,
And with celestial courage fires my breast ;
To arms ! To arms it urges me away,
With tempest-fury hurries me along ;
I hear the battle's din, the tramp of steeds,
The banners beckon, and the trumpet pleads."

It has been objected to this drama, that it violates the truth of history. How far this is an objection we shall not at present attempt to decide. The question is one which embraces a wider field of discussion than our limits will admit. Poetical truth must be, of course, the poet's first

object ; that this is perfectly compatible with the truth of history we have no doubt. The course of human events derives its origin from a mind in which every form of truth is comprehended, and from which every form of truth proceeds. It is not, however, always possible for the finite understanding to reconcile the actual with the ideal, or to detect the harmony which exists between the movements of destiny and the rules of art. Whenever this predicament occurs, let the poet and the critic agree, if they can, which shall be sacrificed. However this question may be decided, thus much seems obvious, that the poet is bound to be faithful rather in the delineation of characters than in the representation of events. Events are generally known, at least, they are within the reach of all ; in respect to them the world is in little danger of being misled. But the means of estimating characters, removed by distance of time or place, are confined to few. Here, then, if ever, it is important that the truth of history should not be violated, and here Schiller did not violate it. In delineating the heroine of Orleans, he has adhered more strictly to reality than any other poet who has attempted the same subject. It is much to be regretted that the sanction of Shakspeare's authority has been given to the vile picture which is sometimes held up as the true likeness of that mysterious character. "Henry VI." certainly gives a more faithful representation of the general condition of that age, than Schiller's romance ; but the Joan of that play is not the Jeanne d'Arc who led the hosts of France to victory. The two have scarcely any thing in common. As to the "Pucelle" of Voltaire, no one, we presume, who is acquainted with that writer, would think of looking there for truth of any kind ; and yet the faith of the community on this subject has been somewhat influenced, we fear, by the aspersions contained in that infamous production.

On the whole, "The Maid of Orleans" is likely to remain the most popular of Schiller's dramas. And well does it deserve this preëminence. It has this distinguishing merit among others, that it vindicates the power of the human will, and is not clouded by that dark fatality which obscures the author's other works, and which, however favorable to the peculiar genius of the Drama, is by no means congenial with the higher purposes of Poetry. Above all, our grati-

tude is due to the poet who has redeemed from infamy one of the noblest characters in history, and so far forth avenged human nature against the foulest scoffer that ever warred with its finer issues. Whoever helps to increase our respect for woman, — whoever contributes any thing to strengthen our faith in the purity and the power of the female character, is a benefactor to society. This benefit has been rendered by Schiller, — this merit is due in an eminent degree to the author of "*The Maid of Orleans*," which will long remain a monument, not less to the goodness of his heart than to the power of his genius. We fully accord with the sentiment expressed in the following lines, addressed by him to his favorite heroine, in which, however, it must be allowed that the poet evinces a very sufficient sense of his own consequence and merits.

"Man's nobler nature hath been wronged in thee,
And in the dust hath thy pure fame been trod.
Wit loves to war with the soul's sovereignty,
It has no faith in angels nor in God;
The heart's best properties it turns to shame,
'Truth its pretence, but ridicule its aim.

But like thyself, sprung from a nobler line,
Herself a pious shepherdess like thee,
Fair Poesy offers thee her aid divine,
To avenge and to exalt thy memory;
With glory she 'll repay thy bitter wrong; —
Born of the spirit, thou shalt live in song.

The unfeeling world delights with obscene arts
To blacken all that 's fair and bright on earth;
But fear thou not! There still are generous hearts,
That glow with love for things of heavenly birth.
Let Momus' tribe amuse the vulgar mind,
A noble nature loves a noble kind."

In pronouncing "*The Maid of Orleans*" the most successful of Schiller's dramas, we have considered the force and singleness of the effect produced by it, rather than the amount of talent implied in its production. Success is not always a sure gauge of power. "*Wallenstein*," with less unity of effect and less theatrical truth than the play just

mentioned, discovers far greater capacities, larger resources, and a wider and deeper reach of thought. It is the richest and most philosophical of all the author's works, — a world of poetry, containing within itself every element of art, and a reflection of almost every form of mortal being. History and romance, philosophy and action, ambition and virtue, destiny and will, love and devotion, are made to pass alternately before us; and a solution of all these in the poet's own mind, furnishes the ground-tone of the piece. In this, more than in any other performance, the author has forgotten himself, and given his characters and events a purely objective being. In so doing he has fulfilled one of the first requisitions of true poetry. "*Wallenstein*" is a work which moves us less at first than many others, for it requires to be studied in order to be felt and understood; but it is one to which the reader will often recur, and in which he will find a boundless field of speculation. The author has not done wisely, it seems to us, in separating entirely the comic from the serious part of his subject. The former he has thrown into a kind of dramatic prologue, which is intended to give a lively picture of military life in general, and of the peculiar character which that life bore in *Wallenstein's* age. This part of the play is called "*Wallenstein's Camp*"; it is chiefly distinguished for its bold and sprightly humor, and in this respect differs from any thing else which Schiller has produced. A portion of it * has been ascribed to Goethe; if we were to judge from its internal character alone, we should pronounce him the author of the whole; in point of manner, it bears a close resemblance to "*Faust*." We regret, that Mr. Coleridge should have omitted this portion of "*Wallenstein*," in his masterly translation. The following song, which occurs at the close of the piece, though it possesses little poetical merit, paints in strong colors, the feelings and the life of a soldier of Dugald Dalgetty's age and stamp.

"Away to the field! go forth! go forth!
To freedom and glory ye gallants!
In the field the true man knows his worth,
There hearts are weighed in the balance,
There each one must stand for himself alone,
No arm can avail him there but his own.

* The Sermon of the Capuchin Friar.

Freedom is now no more to be found,
With tyrants and slaves the earth's swarming,
Fraud and oppression rule the world round,
— A cowardly race conforming ; —
He who can face death brow to brow,
The soldier's the only freeman now.

He casts away life's cares and its gloom,
No fear hath he and no sorrow,
Boldly he waits a soldier's doom,
It may come to-day or to-morrow,
If not till to-morrow, — to-day let us drain
The last dear drops in life's cup that remain.

Heaven sends us our portion, it comes with mirth,
It comes without toil or measure,
While the peasant wrings from the stingy earth
A scanty, pitiful treasure.
He toils through life a drivelling slave,
And digs and digs, till he digs his grave.

The soldier and his steed withal,
They are guests none receive without dreading ;
The lamp burns high in the bridal hall,
Unbidden we come to the wedding,
Brief is our wooing and simple our form,
The hearts that we covet we carry by storm.

Why mourneth the maiden and wringeth her hands ?
Let him go ! let his memory perish !
No home hath the soldier, he heeds no bands,
True love he may not cherish ;
Fate hurries him on an endless race,
On earth he hath no resting-place.

Then away to the field ! leave hearts and leave homes ;
Farewell to love's caresses !
While youth beats high, and life's goblet foams,
Away ere the foam effervesces !
Let him who would win his life at last,
Risk life and all on the battle's cast."

In addition to the original works, which have now been mentioned, Schiller has introduced upon the German stage some of the best specimens of the dramatic literature of

other nations. His translations from the Greek, the English, and the French are well executed, and bear honorable testimony to his diligence as well as to the extent of his acquisitions, though they cannot add to his poetic fame. As a lyric poet, Schiller occupies a high, though by no means the highest rank among the poets of his country. We must place Goethe, Uhland, and Schlegel, if not Körner, Stollberg, and several others, above him. Among his lyric productions, the ballads are, on the whole, the most successful. These were written in a spirit of friendly rivalry with Goethe, and will bear a comparison with the best works of the kind in Germany, or in any country. "*The Song of the Bell*" is enough to confer immortality on any man, and "*The Walk*" possesses, perhaps, more of the spirit of poesy than any thing else that Schiller has produced.

But the greater part of his minor poems do not, as it seems to us, do justice to his genius, nor sustain the reputation acquired by his dramatic labors. Some of them, as the "*Ideale*," for instance, like Byron's poems, betray more of personal feeling and individual purpose, than is consistent with true poetry. Others want the genuine lyric character, — that perfect, but light embodying of a single idea, exhibiting only its poetic features linked together by an almost imperceptible train of suggestions, — that capacity of satisfying without exhausting each point, which should distinguish this species of composition, and for which, among English poets, Burns and Wordsworth are so remarkable. The proper qualifications of a lyric poet, — the mobility and universality of feeling, — the heart's ready sympathy with every thought or image, which the fancy may suggest, — these were possessed by Schiller in a very imperfect degree. He was deficient in *poetic feeling*, a quality more essential in fugitive poetry, than in productions of a graver cast. Here was Schiller's great defect; and it is a defect, which, in the final judgment of the world, will prevent him, we think, from occupying the station which he now holds in the rank of poets. We have ventured, with some hesitation, to offer the following translations of two, among those of his minor poems, which have given us the greatest pleasure. The extreme difficulty of rendering lyric metres from such a language as the German, into corresponding English measures, must be our apology for the liberties we have taken

with these and other pieces. It has been our aim, rather to preserve the tone and spirit of the original, than to convey the exact meaning of each particular verse.

“THE PILGRIM.

Life's first beams were bright around me
When I left my father's cot,
Breaking every tie that bound me
To that dear and hallowed spot.

Childish hopes and youthful pleasures,
Freely I renounced them all,
Went in quest of nobler treasures,
Trusting to a higher call.

For to me a voice had spoken,
And a Spirit seemed to say
Wander forth! — the path is broken,
Yonder, eastward lies thy way.

Rest not till a golden portal
Thou hast reached; — there enter in,
And what thou hast prized as mortal,
There, immortal life shall win.

Evening came and morn succeeded,
On I sped and never tired;
Cold, nor heat, nor storm I heeded,
Boundless hope my soul inspired.

Giant cliffs rose up before me,
Horrid wilds around me lay,
O'er the cliffs my spirit bore me,
Through the wilds I forced my way;

Came to where a mighty river
Eastward rolled its sullen tide;
Forth I launched with bold endeavour, —
'Pilgrim stream be thou my guide!'

It hath brought me to the ocean,
Now, upon the wide, wide sea,
Where's the land of my devotion?
What I seek seems still to flee.

Woe is me! no path leads thither,
Earth's horizons still retreat;
Yonder never will come hither,
Sea and sky will never meet!"

"RITTER TOGGENBURG.

A BALLAD.

'Knight, the love I owe a brother
I devote to thee, —
Seek, bold Knight, oh seek no other!
For it may not be.
Let me see thy peace returning
And thy self-command,
My calm soul thy restless yearning
Cannot understand.'

And the Knight he heard in silence,
Durst no longer stay,
From her arms with sudden violence
Tore himself away.
Straight his followers round him rallied,
Formed a gallant band:
With the cross begirt, they sallied
To the Holy Land.

There, his figure wan and gory
Led the battle's van,
And with many a deed of glory
Scared the Mussulman.
But the barb still rankled in him,
Fame brought no relief,
Back to life it could not win him,
Could not soothe his grief.

Twelve long months he bore the burden
He could bear no more,
Then renounced the victor's guerdon
And the Paynim shore;
Saw a vessel, home returning,
Sail from Joppa's strand,
Flew to still his spirit's yearning
In his native land.

To the loved one's hall he bounded :
At her castle gate,
Sad, alas ! the tidings sounded,
He had come too late.
' She you seek, from earth translated,
With the convent's vows,
Yesterday was consecrated
Heaven's accepted spouse.'

Then the Knight renounced for ever
Castle, sword and spear,
Saw his faithful vassals never,
Nor his steed so dear ;
Left the grey ancestral towers,
Famed for knightly deeds,
Went in quest of humbler bowers,
Clothed in pilgrim's weeds ;

Near her consecrated dwelling
Built his hermit-cell,
Where along the valley swelling
Pealed the convent bell.
There in lowly self-abasement,
Humble and resigned,
Oft he gazed toward the casement
Where his love was shrined.

Till her figure he discovered,
Till her image mild
Bending o'er the valley hovered,
On the valley smiled.
Then the Knight forgot his sorrow,
And, released from pain,
Slept in peace, until the morrow
Bade him weep again.

Years he spent in that lone bower,
Steadfast and resigned,
Watching still the convent tower
Where his love was shrined.
Thus one morning found him lying
Wrapt in death's embrace ;
Calm the eye that even in dying
Gazed on that dear face."

Schiller's genius did not confine itself to poetry. His fame, as an historian, is not less extensive, and will, probably, prove as lasting, as his dramatic reputation. His "Thirty Years' War" and his "Revolt of the Netherlands" (although the latter work is a fragment) are beautiful specimens of philosophic history, and probably have never been surpassed by any thing in that department.

As a philosopher, Schiller has added nothing to the reputation which his country has acquired in that province of intellectual labor. He has thrown no light on the great topics of transcendental inquiry. His philosophical lucubrations are mostly occupied with doubts and queries, to the solution of which no key is given. *Reason*, or the intuitive faculty, appears in him to have been almost dormant. He had thought much on those questions respecting matter and spirit, life and form, human nature and human destiny, which must needs occupy, at some time or other, every reflecting mind; but he labored with the understanding only, and therefore to little purpose. He was one of those inquirers, who are destined never to come to any fixed decision, never to be at peace with themselves, but to wander through life without any settled faith, for ever seeking and never finding. From a mind so conditioned, a regular system of philosophy was not to be expected, nor is it easy to gather from Schiller's writings a decided philosophical opinion of any kind. So far, however, as his views in relation to the subject abovementioned are discoverable from his poetry, they appear to be somewhat tinged with materialism and its accompanying fatalism. The strong contempt for metaphysics, which he has expressed in some of his minor poems,* sufficiently accounts for the defectiveness of his philosophy, and proves that, however he might study Kant for æsthetic purposes, he had no faith nor any hearty interest in the progress and success of that science, whose high calling it is to unfold and to interpret the spiritual world. As a worshipper of Truth, he could not be indifferent to the objects of metaphysical inquiry, but he was no believer in the possibility of their being attained by human efforts.

* See "Die Philosophen," "Der Metaphysiker," and "Die Weltweisen."

The most prominent quality in Schiller's intellectual character, — that which formed the foundation of his success as a poet, — was, unquestionably, his creative power, his ability to produce finished works of art, characterized by unity of purpose, continuity of interest, and entireness of effect. Works of this kind are more rare in German, than in any other literature. Possessed with the love of philosophizing peculiar to their countrymen, the writers of fiction in that language have ever some other object in view than the regular and harmonious developement of the subject before them. The progress of a story, the interest of a plot, are with them matters of secondary importance ; it is the exhibition of some variety of human nature, or some form of human life ; the exercise of the imagination, the indulgence of personal or general satire, or the illustration of some philosophical truth, which chiefly occupies them. The story is nothing more than a pretence for bringing these things before the public. This is particularly true of their better novels, which differ, in this respect, from those of every other nation. They have nothing epic, they pursue no straight-forward course ; the reader is not, as in one of Scott's or Miss Edgeworth's compositions, hurried irresistibly along by a single thread of narrative, which holds him captive until the work is finished, but is placed in a labyrinth of striking thoughts and beautiful illustrations, having no necessary connexion or dependence, through which he is left to find his way as he can. This it is, that so perplexes English readers on their first introduction to German literature. Unacquainted with this species of composition, they sit down to a German novel as they would to an English work of the same title, never doubting but that they are to be entertained with a pleasant story ; instead of which, they are treated to a series of philosophical disquisitions.

This species of composition, as it has been managed by Goethe and Jean Paul, seems to us to hold a much higher rank than the historical novel. That it should be less attractive to the mass of readers, we can easily conceive ; but we are persuaded that no person of cultivated mind who takes up one of Goethe's novels, knowing what he is to expect, and not judging according to rules drawn from the works of other countries, will find them deficient in interest. This

feature in German works of fiction proceeds rather from a peculiarity of taste, than from want of epic power, the existence of which, in that nation, has been sufficiently proved by many of their lighter works, particularly by those of Tieck, Hoffinan, and Baron Motte Fouqué. In general, however, it must be allowed that the German genius is too expansive for epic composition, it loves to lose itself in airy speculations, and wants that contractile power which is necessary to concentrate the interest of a work around a single point. To this general rule, Schiller forms a remarkable exception. There never was a poet in whose works unity and wholeness, harmony of form and concentration of interest, were more conspicuous than in his. In this respect he seems less intimately related to his own country than most of his contemporaries. We cannot subscribe to the sentence which has pronounced him a peculiarly *national* poet. We know of no German writer, unless it be Tieck, who is less German.

Schiller's writings are characterized by an exuberance of beautiful thought; they abound in noble sentiments and memorable sayings, and would furnish forth a large commonplace book of choice extracts. Few writers afford so rich a field for quotation; it is hardly possible to open a volume of his works without lighting upon some striking truth, which, if not absolutely new, has all the force and charm of novelty. His diction, though far from elegant, is always spirited and full of nervous strength. Eloquence may be reckoned one of his most prominent attributes.

As a set-off against these and other excellences, impartial criticism obliges us to mention some no less prominent defects. We have already alluded to the want of poetic feeling. That finer spirit which animates so many of our English poets, which constitutes the principal charm of Milton, Wordsworth, and others, which occasionally enlivens Goethe's page and breathes through every line of Umland, — that undefinable essence, which consists not in any metaphysical subtilty of thought, but in infinite refinement of feeling, — forms no element in Schiller's verse. He is eloquent, but not poetical. Nearly allied to this defect is the want of sympathy with nature. That Schiller was capable of describing nature no one can doubt, who has read "The

Walk" or "William Tell"; but the manner in which he describes her convinces us that

"Nature ne'er could find the way
Into his heart."

His descriptions are accurate and strongly colored, but stiff and formal; unlike the descriptions of one, who reproduces the scene described from his own conceptions, but rather resembling sketches copied from sight, line for line, with the anxious minuteness of one who reads nature with the eye only, and thinks to convey an adequate impression by giving a labored portrait. He describes as the ancients described, and as Scott describes. The forms of outward things painted themselves in his mind singly and in their local order, and there remained as separate existences, having no essential connexion. It is not thus, that Nature presents herself to one who has felt all her power, and has learned to interpret her forms. With such a one there is no separation of parts, but a mental solution of each element into one whole. A landscape to him is not a *collection* of trees, hills, and streams, but a living thing breathing, waving, glowing with pulses and organs, that seem endued with conscious being. Whoever will compare one of Scott's minute and laborious descriptions of natural scenery, with a careless sketch from Wordsworth's Muse, cannot fail to perceive the difference we are attempting to define. The latter poet whom we can never think of but as an out-door liver, — a wanderer by wood and stream, — has beautifully illustrated that peculiar feeling, which we have termed sympathy with nature, from his own experience.

"And I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round Ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
A motion and a spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things."

We shall not bring in judgment against Schiller the puerile and often absurd extravagances of his earlier produc-

tions ; in consideration of the severe judgment which the author himself passed upon them at a later period, and the care with which he avoided them in his subsequent works. We only regret that, instead of revising these juvenile efforts, he suffered them to go down to posterity in their present crude condition.

In addition to the abovementioned defects, we cannot forbear mentioning one which would not have been noticed in a writer of less serious pretensions, but must not be passed over in a poet of Schiller's standing. From a first-rate poet we expect something more than poetry. We expect a familiarity with every form of mental action, and above all we expect that *philosophic wisdom* which is the crown of human attainments, — that wisdom which not only perceives the true relations and exact value of passing forms and occurrences, but has power to penetrate far into the future, and, from its knowledge of the influences which guide the course of human affairs, to cast the figure of coming times. It was not without reason that the poet and the prophet were originally designated by a common appellation. Something of the prophetic spirit the genuine priest of Apollo should always possess. He should unite with other offices peculiar to his high calling, that of the sage and the seer. Raised above the passions and conflicts of this lower world, he should be able to look down with an untroubled eye, and a just discrimination, and a clear forecast on the path of human destiny ; and though, seeing only in part, he can prophesy only in part, he should fall no whit below the highest degree of mental illumination accorded to man. Among the few who have attained this light, Schiller has no place. We have already seen that he was no philosopher, and it need scarcely be added, that the want of a settled philosophy must necessarily have precluded those clear views of nature and life, which constitute the kind of wisdom we are describing. Few have excelled him in the power of giving form and color to all that came within the sphere of his discernment, but that sphere was bounded by the commonest limits of human vision.

On what grounds the American editor of this biography pronounces our author a "*moral poet*," we are at a loss to divine. That he has written nothing very wicked, certainly affords no ground for such an appellation. The

most that can be said of him is, that the tendency of his writings is not decidedly *immoral*. But surely something more is necessary than this negative quality to constitute a moral poet. We are not aware that there is any thing in Schiller's productions that should give him a preëminence in this respect above the rest of his countrymen.

In the estimation of the Germans, Schiller has long held the foremost place among native poets, and probably will long continue to do so. A select circle prefer Goethe, but Schiller is the poet of the *people*. This popularity is to be attributed partly to the fact that he is more intelligible than most of his countrymen, and partly to the zeal with which, in early life, he advocated liberal sentiments; but principally to the circumstance that he was a *dramatic* poet, that he wrote for the stage, and was therefore continually brought before the people. A play-writer possesses, in this respect, great advantages, as has been observed by Richter with particular reference to the case of Schiller.

"I will devote," says this writer, in his *Katzenberger's Badereise*, "a brief episode to the benefit of stage-poets, showing why *they* are in much greater danger of being made fools to vanity than other authors. In the first place, it is evident, how far one of the latter class with his scattered recluse-readers,—honored but little, and that only by cultivated men,—applauded only in the silence and retirement of studies a hundred miles distant from each other,—read perhaps twice in succession, but not *heard* forty times in succession,—it is evident, I say, how far such an *Irus* in fame, a 'John Lackland,' falls below the stage-poet, who not only wears these laurel-gleanings upon his head, but adds to them the rich harvest,—that prince and chimney-sweep, and every generation, and every age, get his thoughts into their heads and his name into their mouths,—that often the most miserable market-towns, whenever a more miserable strolling actor's theatre moves into them, harness themselves to the triumphal car upon which such a writer is borne, &c.

"There are a hundred other advantages which, by means of the figure of omission (*figura præteritionis*), we might mention, but which we prefer to omit; this, for example, that a dramatic author (and oftentimes he is present and hears all) employs, as it were, a whole corporation of hands in

his service (at home one man only holds him in his left, vexatiously turning over the leaves with the right); — furthermore, that he is learned by heart, not only by the actors, but, after continual repetition, by the hearers also, — that he is continually praised anew in all the standing, though tedious, theatrical notices of the daily and monthly journals. Whence follow many things; for example, that an ordinary writer, like Jünger or Kotzebue, lives longer in his plays which are *heard*, than in his novels which are *read*. Hence we may explain the fact, that our cold Germany has exerted herself so much and so well for Schiller and so little for Herder. For, if worth were the measure of gratitude, Herder, the earlier, the loftier, the more many-sided genius, the Oriental-Grecian, the opposer (in his popular ballads) of Schiller's reflective poetry, the spirit who labored with forming energy in so many sciences, and whose only fault was, that he did not fly with all his wings, but, like those prophet-figures, was covered by four, while raised by two, — this man would have deserved a monument, not by the side of, but above Schiller, if, as has been said, it were not for the actors, or the public which has so few sides to match his many-sidedness."

It is much to be regretted that a writer of Schiller's standing, in this age of the world, should have devoted the principal part of his life to a department of art so questionable in its tendency, and so surely destined to decay, as the drama. We have neither time nor inclination to explain our objections to theatrical amusements. The fact, that Goethe in his latter years regretted having devoted so large a portion of his time and talents to these pursuits,* furnishes a stronger argument against them than any reasoning which we could offer.

The relation in which Schiller and Goethe stood to each other, has led to many comparisons of their respective merits. We shall not repeat the parallel so often drawn, and for which there is, in our estimation, so little ground. Goethe and Schiller differed too widely, in kind and in degree, to admit of any just comparison between them. Of the latter we will not say, as was said by some of his own

* See Wilhelm Meister's Wanderjahre, chap. 13th, Vienna ed. 1821.

countrymen, judging in the spirit of a too narrow distinction, — that he was “no poet,” — on the contrary, in the words of Goethe, “we make bold to call him a poet, and a great poet;” and, though constrained to place him immeasurably below his illustrious colleague, we cannot but allow him a high rank in that immortal band, who by their learning and their genius have raised Germany to an equality with the most cultivated nations of the earth, and given to the German mind an influence over the rest of the world, the more remarkable from the fact, that the physical and political condition of that country have precluded it from acquiring any ascendancy by extension of commerce or force of arms.

ART. V. — *Sermons on Duties belonging to Some of the Conditions and Relations of Private Life*. By JOHN G. PALFREY, A. M., Professor of Biblical Literature in the University of Cambridge. Boston. Charles Bowen. 1834. 8vo. pp. 368.

WE are happy in expressing our obligation to the diligent and faithful author of these discourses for this valuable contribution to the stores, already rich and various, of pulpit instruction. Of the topics of preaching, few, we believe, will be found more profitable, than those of the class composing this volume. For, however necessary or interesting may be the discussion of other subjects, as the illustration of the doctrines, the exhibition of the evidences or of the history of Christianity, — and no one will doubt, that in their due places and proportion these will engage the attention of every faithful teacher, — there are none, which may more profitably be enforced, than those relating to the private and social duties of life. The intimacy and sacredness of these relations, in which almost every human being, directly or by reflection, partakes; their close connexion with the highest interests of human life; the daily recurrence of some of the duties they involve; the delicacy, arduousness, and sometimes the perplexity of others, and the undeniable importance of all in every just

view that can be taken of religion, secure for this class of topics an interest, which sermons, it must be confessed, do not always excite. Every one perceives, that here are considered relations which he fills now, or hopes to fill hereafter, or of the discharge of which by others he is the object, and is therefore personally concerned, that they be fulfilled faithfully. It is precisely of this last description of duties men love to hear more than of any others. On the same principle, that it is pleasanter to think of the sins of our neighbour than of our own, we prefer to hear of the offices, which others are to perform for us, rather than of those, which we are to render to them.

Accordingly, of the vast body of sermons preached or published, those have been welcomed with special pleasure, and, what is more to the purpose, have better accomplished, we are disposed to believe, the objects of preaching, which have treated, as is successfully done by the writer before us, the duties of the aged and of the young, of husbands and wives, of parents and children, of brethren and sisters, of masters and servants; or those, which grow out of the particular conditions or changes of the human lot, as of prosperity or affliction, riches or poverty, sickness or health. Hence they who are conversant with the sermons of the most eminent practical preachers, will not fail to distinguish, as claiming special commendation, those of Barrow, on some of the most common personal virtues, as patience, contentment, and industry in our callings, or against some social vices, as censoriousness, evil speaking, and meddling with other men's business; those of Tillotson, on the parental education of children and sincerity of speech; others of Secker, on the duties of the rich and poor, of the young, the aged, and the sick; the admirable devotional discourses of Cappe, upon the uses of sickness, and the benefits of affliction; with many more recent productions by our own, as well as by English divines, whom we need not here particularize.

These discourses of Professor Palfrey are entitled to an honorable place with those we have mentioned. And they have the superior advantage of presenting within the limits of a single volume, — of no ordinary typographical beauty, — a natural and systematic arrangement of most of the private

social duties. For ourselves, we have perused them with satisfaction and thankfulness to the author. The careless, and we know not but we should add, the critical reader, will scarcely help complaining of the occasional length of the sentences, and sometimes, it must be confessed, of an involved expression, leaving him in doubt of a meaning, which upon search, he may find too good and full to be lost or obscured. But with this exception, he will not fail to profit from the discriminating, weighty, and instructive manner of the preacher; from the tone of deep seriousness, moreover, and not seldom the eloquence, with which his various topics are enforced.

Of these topics, there will be found some in this volume of acknowledged difficulty and delicacy. The relations, for example, of the rich and the poor, of masters and of servants, as existing in our free community, and under our forms of government, are such as require, for their discussion, a tender and judicious, as well as faithful hand. The mutual rights and obligations of husbands and wives, the heart-stirring question, when power shall be exercised and when submission must be yielded, are points of indescribable interest. And to exhibit faithfully, yet reverently, "*The Duties of the Aged*" is no easy task to a preacher, himself scarcely in the meridian of his days. Now upon these, and points of like delicacy, Mr. Palfrey seems to us to have exercised singular judgment and fidelity.

Thus, in discoursing of the duties and temptations of old age, having spoken of its tendency to avarice and self-indulgence, he remarks, that the aged are in danger of becoming opinionative and dogmatical. And in his illustration of this, we are reminded of the sentiment of the eminent Dr. Beddoes, who in complaining of the unreasonable distrust usually felt of young physicians, and the blind confidence as generally reposed in the old, observes, that the boasted experience of the latter, may possibly prove only an accumulation of errors, the antiquated prejudices of youth, which years had not corrected, but rather multiplied and made inveterate.

"The advantage of experience is what gives age the better claim to the praise of wisdom. But he is not always most experienced who is oldest. Experience is not merely given by years; it is to be gathered by care; and, of two men, he will

often have the most of its instructions, who has had the least of its discipline. The respective advantages and disposition for becoming acquainted with a given subject, as well as the length of time that one has lived in the world, are to be taken into view in determining the probability whether one or another is best acquainted with it. It may even well happen, that the opinion which claims to be announced on the authority of experience, had been taken up at an early period of life, when its advocate was much less experienced than he is now who dissents from it, and had been maintained since only from habit, and without examination. In such cases, the claim of ampler experience is evidently not to be urged by age. And in all cases it is rather one for youth respectfully to acknowledge, than for age arrogantly to assert." — pp. 66, 67.

The following sentiment will be prized for its encouragement and consolation, by the infirm and exhausted Christian, who, in his days of labor and sorrow, is ready to say, not only "I have no pleasure in them," but "I have lost, what to me was of far more value, the ability of doing good."

"Let no one venture to call himself useless as long as he can remember, and judge, and speak, though there should be nothing else that he can do. So long he may be most useful, for so long he can bear a testimony, which from him will be impressive, to the worth of Christian goodness, and point out to younger travellers its path of peace. Nay, so long as in those days, which are called days of labor and sorrow, he is able to show the power of the religion of Jesus, to help him to suffer with serenity, so long he may be doing a service to those around him, more precious than man can estimate. And let none be insensible to the responsibilities which this age thus imposes on them. With the reverence, which attaches to it, its discourse and its example must needs have a vast influence, whether for good or evil. Are the stores of its guilty experience exposed, to clothe vice in new attractions, or teach to less practised cunning, new deceits? The worst work of depravity is then done while the sinner is drawing nearest to his doom. Is it employed to the last in winning souls to truth and heaven, by the rich lessons of its wisdom, and the beautiful attractions of its virtues? There is scarcely an earthly ministry of benevolence so powerful, or so deserving of all hearty gratitude." — pp. 75, 76.

The three sermons to the young, which form an appropri-

ate commencement of the volume, abound in weighty reflections, worthy the deep consideration of those, to whom they are addressed. In the first, particularly, is exhibited in its solemn light, the importance of early religion and the inestimable value of that golden period of our days, in establishing a conviction of its truth, and subjecting the affections, habits, and life to its power.

The dangers of the rich, are exhibited with a graceful union of fearlessness, honesty, and courtesy, well becoming the pulpit. Of these, the preacher first mentions the arrogant spirit, which their condition is apt to engender, the folly and impolicy, no less than cruelty of which, are made evident. We do not believe, that arrogance is the sin most easily besetting the rich in our community, where wealth alone, when coupled with profligacy, or only serving to make folly conspicuous, will not avail to protect, still less to make honorable the possessor. But there is another fault, far more common among us. "This," to adopt the description of our author, "is that vain and thoughtless elation of feeling, which, without taking the form of an offensive deportment to others, is itself a wasting evil to the individual mind."

It is easy from this general description to see at once the nature of the evil; and, from the graphic delineation which is given of its bad effects, they, who are in danger, and many such there be, may take warning.

We invite attention to the excellent discourses on the duties of the sick. This is a numerous class of sufferers among the human family, with whom, at any hour, accident,—or that which men call such,—may set us. The most vigorous of to-day, whose strength is as brass, and whose hopes are most buoyant, may, before to-morrow, become the victims of disease, and days and nights of weariness be appointed them. It is surprising, when we consider the perpetual and universal exposure to this trial, how little preparation is usually made for it; and how little attention is given, when it comes, to the nature and variety of the duties belonging to it. The passive virtues only, forbearance from complaining, and that vague and indefinite feeling which passes for resignation, and which, it is to be feared, is oftener expressed for decorum's sake, than realized, are usually regarded as the demanded graces of the patient. This error

is refuted by our author, and we regret, that our limits permit us only to refer to the eloquent passage (page 110), in which he shows, that there is "hardly a place of more responsible service than a sick chamber; a place where Christian principle is better tried, or a more heroic spirit may shine forth."

The relation of master and servant, as existing in our free community, and under institutions, in which the rich and the poor, the employer and the employed, are continually alternating conditions, is one of a confessedly difficult nature; and no small measure of good sense as well as of right feeling is essential, on both sides, to the faithful discharge, and even just understanding of their duties. This delicate topic Mr. Palfrey has treated with his accustomed prudence and considerateness. He enforces on masters the peremptory obligation of punctual payment of wages, which may never unrighteously be kept back; a kind regard to the feelings of servants, which "are often delicate and always human;" justice to their characters and interests; abstaining from displeasure uncalled for, or unreasonable in degree, from all arrogance and contempt in our deportment, and consulting, as far as we are able, their wishes, their comfort, and, above all, their spiritual welfare.

In enforcing, on the other side, the duties of servants, who are commanded by apostolic authority to obey their masters in all things, it is shown, that this obedience has respect to the nature of the service required, and the spirit in which it is to be rendered; it being, of course, in subordination to the will of God, whose laws may never be violated in submission to any human authority.

In the explanation of the text, from Colossians iii. 22, and iv. 1, we find the following very important reflection; and we set it down in this place for the special instruction of such ardent but mistaken philanthropists among us, as think they are justified, from their abhorrence of slavery and their zeal for universal emancipation, to interfere with the constitutions of civil government, or the personal rights of individuals.

"The Apostle in the text," says the preacher, "had reference to the condition of involuntary servitude, which though Christianity could not approve, it did not undertake at once to overthrow, but left to be supplanted in the gradual progress of its benevolent principles; steadily true, in this as in other

things, to the rule of not rudely disturbing the political relations of society, but merely establishing principles, which in the gradual course of time, would surely and safely reform them all." — p. 343.

Under the general description of servants, is here included that very numerous and important class of our young brethren and fellow-citizens, apprentices. Their condition, duties, and temptations cannot fail of being a subject of lively interest to all friends of youth, who know from experience their dangers, and to every reflecting member of the community. The peculiar exposures of that portion of our young men, who leave the protection of the domestic roof and the simple habits of the country, for employment in the city, are fearfully presented in the discourse, with which the volumes concludes. We earnestly concur with the writer, in the opinion, that for this exposed portion of society "it is fully time that more thought was taken;" and we hope his good suggestions will be followed.

"Year by year, there come into the city, numbers of youth of good prospects, of happy promise to their friends, and as yet fair characters, to take at first the subordinate tasks in the business by which they hope in due time to get their living. Dismissed from the domestic watch of their parents' home, where their purity had hitherto been protected, and not received into the house of their employers, they suddenly become, except in their hours of service, completely their own masters, at the most tempted age. In the excitement of the first view of a gay and crowded capital, inexperienced, new to the exercise of such entire liberty, they dwell for the most part with a number of their equals, who may improve or may corrupt them; but at all events free, through their hours of leisure, from any control or effectual oversight. Often, it may be supposed, no cognizance whatever is taken by their masters of the way in which they employ the time, not required to be past by them at their place of business. Unquestioned, they are at liberty to disturb the night with their revellings, and profane the sabbath, and annoy its quiet worshippers, with the speed and noise of their excursions of boisterous mirth; and, through the means of this license, falling in with the solicitations and example of bad company, it is to be feared that not a few, without having, like others, principle enough of their own to protect them, are ruined, year by year. I would ask, whether the public quiet is not to be protected from them, or, what is of more consequence, whether their own innocence is not to be protected against

their own inexperience? If this is to be done, by whom must it be done, except by masters, to whom alone, in the absence of parents they are directly responsible? Is it not due from masters to them, to extend some superintendence over the course which they are taking, and endeavour to raise some barriers between them and temptation; to interpose for their security with seasonable counsel; to open to them their own houses, and put them, for their hours of relaxation, in the way of other safe and improving society; to facilitate their attention to useful and engaging studies; to take care that they choose their homes, where the influences of domestic association upon them will be salutary; and to provide for them the means of a profitable employment of the Lord's day, and have it understood, that it is expected of them to employ those means, — as a privilege, if they are wise enough so to esteem it, — and if not, then as a duty, which they who are wiser feel bound to prescribe? " — pp. 360 – 362.

Though our extracts are multiplying, we think those of our readers, who may not see this volume, will thank us for offering them a share in the pleasure we have taken in the following beautiful picture of the relation of brother and sister.

"In particular, the relation of brother and sister to one another, is undoubtedly one of the most beautiful which Providence has instituted; forbidding, from the different pursuits of the two sexes, any thing of that rivalry and interference, which is so often the bane of friendship among other equals, and, without the possibility of the sentiment being tainted with any alloy of passion, finding scope for that peculiar tenderness, strength, trustingness of attachment, which belong to the relation of delicacy, dependence, and retirement on the one part, to energy, self-reliance, and enterprise on the other. Is any thing more delightful, than to witness this relation sustained, as God, when he arranged it, designed that it should be? a mutual confidence, and esteem, and sense of privilege in each other's regard, evinced and renewed in every daily communication; the sister watching the brother's growing virtues and consequence with a modest pride, while she checks his adventurousness with her well-timed scruples, and finds for him a way to look more cheerfully on his defeats, — the brother, looking on the sister's graces with a fondness that would be like a parent's, only that it is gayer, more confident, and more given to expression, and studying, with ambitious assiduity, to requite the gentle guidance, to which his impetuous spirit delights to yield

itself; the one, zealous and constant in all acceptable kindnesses, in her secluded sphere, which God has given her an intuitive sagacity to invent, the other delighting to communicate all means of improvement, which his different opportunities of education have prepared him to offer; the one, gratefully conscious of a protection as watchful as it will be prompt and firm, the other of an interested love, which, whether in silence or in words, can speak his praises, the most movingly, where he may most desire to have them spoken. Is any thing in the relations appointed by him, who, for wise and kind ends, 'hath set the solitary in families,' more delightful to witness, than such a brotherly and sisterly devotion? If there be, it is what remains to be added to the picture. It is seen, when they who are thus united, make the younger members of their band a common care, and turn back to offer the gentle and encouraging hand of a love more discreet than that of mere equals, and more familiar than the parental, to lead their childish unpractised steps along that path of filial piety, of fraternal union and religious wisdom, which themselves, walking together in it, have found, throughout, a way of such pleasantness and peace. Yes; earth has no fairer sight, than a company, so marshalled, of young travellers to heaven." — pp. 333 – 335.

On the whole, few volumes of sermons, will be found, we believe, more useful than this, whether we consider the nature of the subjects treated, or the fullness, variety, and importance of the thoughts exhibited. We must regret, that they are not generally characterized by more simplicity of style, because in all other respects they are eminently adapted to do good to all classes of readers. They may instruct those who have yet to learn, and establish those who already believe, that religion is to be exhibited in the most common walks and offices of life; that they, who aspire to be Christians and sons of God, must be good husbands and fathers, good wives and children, good masters and servants; and try to make themselves and their families the better and the happier, by "showing piety at home."

NOTICES AND INTELLIGENCE.

1. *The Charge of Ignorance and Misrepresentation proved against Rev. GEORGE B. CHEEVER.* From the Salem Gazette. Salem. 1833. 8vo. pp. 16. — 2. *The Charge of Ignorance and Misrepresentation proved against "A LOVER OF CUDWORTH AND TRUTH."* From the Salem Gazette. Salem. 1833. 8vo. pp. 24. — 3. *Charity supported by Orthodoxy; Mr. CHEEVER convicted of Ignorance and Misrepresentation, and the Unitarian Faith vindicated.* From the Salem Gazette. Salem. 1834. 8vo. pp. 72. — 4. *Conclusion of the Salem Controversy.* From the Salem Gazette. Salem. 1834. 8vo. pp. 30 — These pamphlets are republications of articles which appeared, in the first instance, in a Salem newspaper, over the signature, "Unitarian," and make part of a controversy provoked by Mr. Cheever's attack on the *character* of Unitarians, "abusive," as it has justly been said, "to a degree unparalleled even in the worst days of theological intolerance and bigotry." The controversy has been carried on with considerable warmth, and led to frequent recriminations and personalities; and this circumstance, together with the impression, that it might help the pretended "Lover of Cudworth and Truth," to the notoriety, which seems to have been his principal object in writing, has inclined some, entertaining the same opinion with ourselves of his intellectual and moral qualities, to question, whether it would not have been better, if no notice whatever had been taken of his "vituperations." We respect the feelings which suggest this doubt; but, at the same time, we believe it to be unauthorized, and that the interests of truth and justice require, imperiously require, that such flippant and unscrupulous assailants, at least until their pretensions are better understood in the community, should be promptly met, and their "ignorance and misrepresentations" be exposed, as in the pamphlets before us. Except that Mr. Cheever, writing over his proper signature in the "Boston Recorder," took occasion highly to extol and recommend his own anonymous communications in the "Salem Gazette," there has been, we believe, a singular unanimity among all parties, in regard to the extreme folly and wickedness of his course, — a kind of distinction not likely to be mistaken, we should think, even by him, for fame. "Unitarian" was constrained, as is commonly the case in discussions of this nature, to give more of his attention than could have been wished, to topics aside from the great questions at

issue; but he evinces throughout much ability, research, and skill, and a Christian temper; and his two last pamphlets, especially, contain treatises on general subjects, such as inspiration, atonement, and the trinity, which may be read everywhere, and will long continue to be read, with advantage and satisfaction.

Massachusetts School Fund. The Legislature of this State passed an Act, at their last session, which provides, "That from and after the first day of January next, all moneys in the Treasury, derived from the sale of lands in the State of Maine, and from the claim of the State on the government of the United States for military services, and not otherwise appropriated, together with fifty *per centum* of all moneys thereafter to be received from the sale of lands in Maine, shall be appropriated to constitute a permanent Fund, for the aid and encouragement of Common Schools: *Provided*, That said Fund shall never exceed One Million of Dollars." The funds already in the Treasury, from the two sources above mentioned, and not otherwise appropriated, amount, we believe, to between four and five hundred thousand dollars. It is further provided by the Act, that the income of this Fund shall be distributed in the Commonwealth in furtherance of the objects specified, "in such manner as the Legislature shall hereafter appoint: *Provided*, That there shall never be paid to any City, Town, or District, a greater sum than is raised therein respectively, for the support of Common Schools." The Committee, in their report, recommended the appointment of two Commissioners, whose duty it should be, by personal investigations, to collect the necessary information on the subject, "and prepare a project of a law for the distribution of the income of the School Fund, and the improvement of the system of Common Schools, and report the same to the next Legislature." This plan, however, we regret to say, was not adopted; but, in lieu thereof, it was resolved, that circulars should be issued by the Secretary, requiring the School Committees of the several towns to make full and specific answers to certain inquiries, respecting the state of the Common Schools, and of education generally, within their respective limits; and, in case any town fails to make such returns, it forfeits its share of the income of the Fund, in the first year of its distribution. The Secretary is to "cause an abstract of these returns to be prepared, and one thousand copies thereof printed, for the use of the next General Court, and laid before them during the first week of their session."

A volume of Discourses, by the late Rev. E. S. GOODWIN, of Sandwich, with a Memoir of their Author, by the Rev. Mr. GOODWIN, of Concord, is announced. We also understand, that the Rev. Professor WARE, Junior, is preparing for the press a volume of Sermons, by the late Dr. PARKER, of Portsmouth, to which a Memoir, by the editor, will be prefixed.

The Christian Connexion have united in supporting a single religious newspaper, *The Gospel Palladium*, published at Broad-albin, N. Y., under the direction of the Christian Union Book Association, and edited by the Rev. Joseph Badger.

The first volume of a translation of *Tholuck's Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, has appeared in the *Biblical Cabinet*, published in Edinburgh. The publisher gives notice of other translations as in progress, to wit:—

Vol. II. of a Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, translated from the original German of Professor Tholuck of Halle. By the Rev. R. Menzies.

The Institutes of Interpretation of the Old Testament, translated from the original of Professor Pareau, of Utrecht. By the Rev. Dr. Forbes, Professor of Humanity, &c., King's College, Aberdeen.

A Collection of Philological and Exegetical Tracts, illustrating difficult passages in the New Testament, translated from the works of Noesselt, Knappe, and Storr. By the Rev. Thomas Byrth, A. M., of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, Perpetual Curate of St. James', Latchford, Lancashire.

A Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Peter, translated from the original German of Dr. Steiger. By Dr. Nachot.

An Exposition of the Parables of Jesus, translated from the original German of Dr. Lisko. By the Rev. J. B. Patterson, Falkirk.

Excursus Koppiani; being a selection of the most important *Excursus* from Koppe's Edition of the New Testament, translated by the Rev. W. Cunningham of Greenock.

A Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians, from the original German of the Rev. K. C. W. F. Bähr.

A History of the Establishing and Conducting of the Christian Church by the Apostles, translated from the original German of Dr. Neander. By the Rev. James Hamilton.

An Introduction to the Characteristic Dialect of the

Authors of the New Testament, translated from the original German of Christ. Gott. Gersdorff.

A Commentary on the Book of Daniel, from the original German of H. A. Christ. Hävernicks.

A Critical Inquiry into the Entire Genuineness of the Book of the Prophecies of Isaiah, from the German of Professor A. F. Kleinert.

A Critical Inquiry into the Authenticity and Integrity of the Books of Daniel and Zechariah, from the German of Professor Hengstenberg of Berlin.

An Introduction to the Hermeneutics of the Authors of the New Testament, from the German of Dr. J. Christ. C. Döpke.

A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, translated from the Original of Börger, Weiner, Koppe, &c. By the Rev. W. B. Cunningham, Prestonpans.

Messrs. Manson, Emerson, & Co., of Cambridge, advertise as in press a new edition of the Common English Bible, comprising the Old and New Testament, and the Apocrypha, to be printed under the superintendence of the Rev. Mr. Coit, of the Episcopal Church. In this edition, the division into chapters and verses is rejected, and one into paragraphs, according to the sense, is substituted, and the poetic portions are printed in parallelisms, after the manner of Lowth's "Isaiah." In other respects, they propose to follow the best and most carefully collated editions, Dr. Blayney's folio of 1769 being taken as the standard. All headings of chapters and column titles are discarded in the new arrangement, but the numerals for the chapters and verses will be set in the margin, so that, for reference, this will be as convenient as any other edition.

Professor Torrey, of the University of Vermont, is preparing a new translation of *Neander's History of the Christian Church*, the first volume of which work, translated in England by H. J. Rose, was noticed about two years ago, in this journal. The second volume of Rose's Translation has not, we believe, been published.

INDEX.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>A.</p> <p>Adam, <i>see</i> Man.</p> <p>B.</p> <p>Barnes, Rev. Albert, on the sufferings of the Saviour, 202.</p> <p>Bible, common English, new edition of, 404.</p> <p>Blasphemy, prosecution for, 90.</p> <p>C.</p> <p>Calvinism, chief evil of, 37.</p> <p>Cambridge, First Church in, Mr. Newell's Discourses on the, 266.</p> <p>Catholic Church, great error of the, 35.</p> <p>Chapman, William, account of his death at sea, 268.</p> <p>Cheever, George B., his illiberality briefly rebuked, 168 — his controversy at Salem, 401.</p> <p>Christ, <i>see</i> Jesus.</p> <p>Christianity, consists mainly in moral truth, 29.</p> <p>Christology, Hengstenberg's, reviewed, 321.</p> <p>Collins, object of his Discourse on the Christian Religion, 322 — writers opposed to him, 323.</p> <p>Combe, George, his System of Phrenology, reviewed, 221.</p> <p>Constitution of Massachusetts amended, 135.</p> <p>Cotton, Rev. John, his great influence in Boston, 126.</p> <p>Cox, Dr. Samuel Hanson, his "Quakerism not Christianity," reviewed, 21 — his extraordinary uncharitableness exposed, 22.</p> <p>Creation, essay on the Mosaic account of the, 174.</p> <p>D.</p> <p>Debt, imprisonment for, 252.</p> <p>Deist's Immortality, a weak tract, 132.</p> | <p>Devotional Exercises, Miss Martineau's, 44.</p> <p>E.</p> <p>Eve, <i>see</i> Woman.</p> <p>Everett, Edward, his Phi Beta Kappa Address, noticed, 1.</p> <p>F.</p> <p>Fall of Man, Moses' account of the, 306.</p> <p>Fosdick, D., Jun., his Translation of De Sacy's Grammar, 263.</p> <p>Frothingham, Rev. N. L., his Sermon on the Boston Thursday Lecture, 125.</p> <p>G.</p> <p>Genesis, account of the Creation in the Book of, 183 — of the first sin and punishment, 306.</p> <p>German works in theology, translations from, advertised, 403.</p> <p>Goodwin, Ezra S., his Discourses announced for publication, 403.</p> <p>Greece, on the state of, from Mr. Everett's Address, 3, 4.</p> <p>H.</p> <p>Harvard College, The Worthy Student of, a Sermon by Prof. Palfrey, 267.</p> <p>Hebrew Scriptures, Spirit of the, No. I., 174 — No. II., 305.</p> <p>Hengstenberg, E. W. Von, his Christology of the Old Testament, reviewed, 321 — indebted for his fame to his orthodoxy, <i>ib.</i> — design of his theory, 333 — his idea of an <i>internal sense</i>, 337 — supposes that the prophets did not always understand their prophecies in their true sense, 340 — his sense of the word Sheol, 352.</p> <p>Higginson, Stephen, obituary notice of, 270.</p> |
|---|--|

Historical Class Book, Sullivan's, noticed, 68. Moses, his account of the Creation, 179 — of the fall, 306.

J.

Jesus Christ, does not require speculative uniformity in his disciples, 24 — Miss Martineau on the love of, 45 — his perfect obedience, 192 — Portraiture of his Sufferings, reviewed, 202 — his sufferings not penal, 205 — the prophecies supposed to relate to him, discussed, 324 *et seq.* — was the Messiah in the sense in which he claimed to be so, 327, 360.

K.

Knowles, Prof. James D., his Memoir of Roger Williams, reviewed, 72.

L.

Latimer's Sermons, 134.
Liberty, religious, provided for by Roger Williams, 83, 90 — does not allow of blasphemy, 90.
Library of Old English Prose Writers, Vol. VII., 134.
Locke's views of toleration, 89.
Lovett, Henry William, his explanation of the Revelation of St. John, 131.
Lunatic Hospital at Worcester, 136.

M.

McLellan, Henry B., his Journal, noticed, 262.
Malcom, Rev. Howard, his Rule of Marriage, reviewed, 52.
Man's dominion, true nature of, 185 — remarks on the nature of man, 256 — his temptation and fall, 306.
Marriage, Christian's Rule of, by Rev. Mr. Malcom, a strange book, 52.
Martineau, Harriet, her Devotional Exercises, noticed, 44 — remarks on her Traditions of Palestine, Illustrations of Political Economy, &c., 47 — her Guide to the Study of the Scriptures, 50.
Messiahship of Christ, 327, 360.
Militia trainings, bad effects of, 253.
More, Sir Thomas, passage from his Utopia on religious liberty, 88.

N.

Nature of man, judged according to facts, 256 — must be considered always in connexion with his education, 259.
Neander's History of the Church, new translation of, announced, 404.
Newell, Rev. William, his two Discourses at Cambridge, 266.

O.

Old Testament, quotations from, in the New, 346 — quotations from, by Jesus, 363.

P.

Palfrey, Rev. John G., his Sermon on the death of Miss Elizabeth Bond, 129 — Sermon occasioned by the death of Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Chapman, 268 — review of his volume of Sermons on the Duties of Private Life, 392.
Parker, Rev. Nathan, life and character of, 103 — his birth, 106 — education, 107 — settlement, *ib.* — his preaching, 108 — ministerial character, 112 — intellectual, 120 — death, 124 — his Sermons announced for publication, 403.
Penitentiary System, Report of the French Commissioners on the, 253.
Phrenology, its relations to morality and religion, considered, 224.
Pierpont, Rev. John, his Sermon on the Burning of the Ephesian Letters, 98 — designed to promote the cause of temperance, 99.
Porter, Dr. Eliphalet, his life and character, 264.
Priestley, Dr. Joseph, notice of his Life, continued, 137 — in Birmingham from 1780 to 1791, 139 — victim of the Birmingham riots, 140 — goes to London, 145 — succeeds Dr. Price at Hackney, 147 — his publications at this period, *ib.* — takes leave of his parish, 148 — arrives at New York, 149 — settles at Northumberland, 150 — his sermons on the Evidences at Philadelphia, 151 — his second visit to

- Philadelphia, 152 — controversy with Volney, 153 — writes his Notes on Scripture, 154 — his last days, 155 — his character as a philosopher, 158 — as a theologian, 159 — defended against the charge of infidelity, 164 — his eulogium by Robert Hall, 167.
- Prison Discipline Society, Eighth Annual Report of the, 251.
- Prophecies of the Messiah in the Old Testament discussed, 324 *et seq.* — particular ones explained, 328 *et seq.*
- Psalm sixteenth, translated and explained, 347.
- Putnam, Rev. George, his Sermon at the funeral of Dr. Porter, 264.
- Q.
- Quakerism, assaulted by Dr. Cox, in his "Quakerism not Christianity," 21 — chief error of, 39.
- R.
- Revelation, The, of St. John, explained by H. W. Lovett, 131.
- Roscoe, William, Life of, by his Son Henry Roscoe, 273 — his birth and early education, 276 — his first published piece, 279 — his marriage, 280 — his exertions in the abolition of the slave-trade, 281 — his Life of Lorenzo de' Medici, 285 — relinquishes the profession of law, 286 — becomes a banker, 289 — commencement of his friendship with Sir J. E. Smith, *ib.* — publishes his Life of Leo X., 290 — member of Parliament for Liverpool, 292 — correspondence with Mr. Brougham, 294 — his difficulties in business, 296 — sells his library, 297 — becomes bankrupt, 298 — publishes his Illustrations of the Life of Lorenzo, 299 — and Memoir of Richard Roberts Jones, 300 — loses his wife, 301 — publishes an edition of Pope's Works, *ib.* — finishes his work on Monandrian Plants, 302 — his last sickness and death, 303, 304.
- Rutt, John Towill, his Life of Priestley, 137.
- S.
- Sacy, A. J. Sylvestre de, his Principles of Grammar, noticed, 263.
- Sadoc and Miriam, a Jewish Tale, noticed, 248.
- Saviour, the sufferings of the, considered, 204.
- Schiller, Friedrich, The Life of, reviewed, 365 — his Robbers, 368 — his Conspiracy of Fiesco, 372 — his Don Carlos, 373 — Maria Stuart, and William Tell, 374 — The Maid of Orleans, 375 — his Wallenstein, 379 — his ballads, 381 — some of them translated, 382 *et seq.* — his philosophy, 385 — estimate of his merits, 387.
- School fund of Massachusetts, 402.
- Sin, doctrine of original, inconsistent with Scripture, 256 — and fact, *ib. et seq.* — origin of, in the account of Moses, 305.
- Social relations, origin of the, 193.
- Society, views of the progress of, 6 — as affected by the Reformation, 13 — by popular institutions, 16.
- Spooner, Lysander, his deistical and superficial pamphlet, 132.
- Sullivan, William, his Historical Class Book, noticed, 68.
- T.
- Temperance, Mr. Pierpont's Sermon on, 98.
- Temptation of Adam, 308.
- Thursday Lecture at Boston, Mr. Frothingham's account of the, 125.
- U.
- Unitarian, The, a new periodical, 133.
- Universalism, ultra, errors of, 37.
- Unity, Christian, remarks on the true grounds of, 24 *et seq.* — in speculation undesirable, 40.
- W.
- Washington, George, anecdote of, in the Life of Roscoe, 288.
- Wheatley, Phillis, Memoir and Poems of, noticed, 169.

Williams, Roger, his Life, by Prof. Knowles, 72 — time and place of his birth, uncertain, 76 — his arrival in Boston, ministry at Salem, &c. 77 — banishment from Massachusetts, and foundation of Providence, 78 — his conduct towards the Indians, 79 — his jealousy of clerical usurpation, 83 — first legis-

lator who provided for the full liberty of conscience, 83 — his interview with Milton, 86 — his writings 87 — his death, 96.

Woman, account of her formation, by Moses, 193 — her temptation of the man, 313.

Worcester, Dr. Noah, his Last Thoughts, reviewed, 254.

THE NEW TESTAMENT in the Common Version, conformed to Griesbach's standard Greek text. Third Edition. 12mo.

A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS, on the Plan proposed by LANT CARPENTER, LL. D.

THE TEACHER'S GIFT TO HIS PUPILS,
WITH NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS. (Second Edition.)

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL SINGING-BOOK; to which are added a few Moral Songs. By GEORGE KINGSLEY. Approved by the Boston Sunday-School Society. 1 vol. 16mo.

A NEW TRANSLATION
OF THE
HEBREW PROPHETS,
Arranged in chronological order. Vol. I.—containing Joel, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah.
By GEORGE R. NOYES.

The *Book of Job* and the *Psalms* have also been translated by Mr. Noyes, and published. The estimation in which these translations are held, may be ascertained in some degree from the following extracts:—

"No translation has appeared in England since that of Isaiah by Lowth, which can sustain a comparison with that of the book of Job, by Mr. Noyes. With some slight exceptions, this latter is very much what we could wish it to be."—*Spirit of the Pilgrims*.

"We cordially welcome this book of Psalms in its new and inviting form. It was with satisfaction we heard of Mr. Noyes's undertaking; one of the most useful and important, as well as responsible, in which a scholar and a theologian can engage. The religious public are already indebted to his labors for the Translation of Job. Those of our readers, — and we hope they are not few, — who are familiar with that excellent work, will already have anticipated benefit and gratification from this. And though it was not to be expected, that so much was to be done, because there was not so much needed, for the improvement of a devotional work, like the Psalms, as for the obscure and difficult book of Job, yet every intelligent reader will perceive in this the same fidelity, good judgment, and taste, which so highly recommended his former translation."—*Christian Register*.

These works have also been very favorably noticed in the *North American Review*, *Christian Examiner*, *N. Y. American*, *Philadelphia National Gazette*, and numerous other periodicals and books.

CHARLES BOWEN,

HAS JUST PUBLISHED

SERMONS

On Duties belonging to some Conditions and Relations of Life.

By JOHN G. PALFREY, A. M.,
Professor of Biblical Literature in Harvard University,
In One Vol. 8vo.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

CHARLES BOWEN,
NO. 141, WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON.

AGENTS.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

PORTSMOUTH, J. W. Foster.
EXETER, F. Grant.
DOVER, & } G. & E. Wadleigh.
GREAT FALLS, }
KEENE, George Tilden.
CONCORD, Marsh, Capen, & Lyon.

MASSACHUSETTS.

CAMBRIDGE, James Munroe, & Co.
CONCORD, J. Stacy.
TAUNTON, F. Dunbar.
SALEM, { Foote & Chisholm.
{ H. Whipple.
DANVERS, A. Trask, Jr.
NEWBURYPORT, Charles Whipple.
HINGHAM, C. & E. B. Gill.
NEW BEDFORD, William Howe.
NANTUCKET, George W. Ewer.
GROTON, A. Richardson.
GREENFIELD, David Clark, Jr.
WORCESTER, C. Harris.
SPRINGFIELD, Elisha Edwards.
NORTHAMPTON, J. H. Butler.
LOWELL, Stevens & Co.

MAINE.

PORTLAND, Colman, Holden, & Co.
HALLOWELL, C. Spaulding.
BELFAST, E. T. Morrill.
AUGUSTA, H. Spaulding.
BANGOR, B. Nourse & Co.
EASTPORT, H. S. Favor.

RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE, { George Dana.
{ A. S. Beckwith & Co.

CONNECTICUT.

NEW HAVEN, H. Howe & Co.
HARTFORD, F. J. Huntington.

VERMONT.

BURLINGTON, E. Smith.

NEW JERSEY.

TRENTON, D. Fenton.

NEW YORK.

ALBANY, W. C. Little.
NEW YORK, C. S. Francis.
TRENTON, Isaac B. Pierce.
CANANDAIGUA, Morse & Harvey.
AUBURN, H. Ivison & Co.
BUFFALO, O. G. Steele.
ROCHESTER, C. & M. Morse.

PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADELPHIA, Henry Perkins.
PITTSBURG, Johnson & Stockton.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE, E. J. Coale & Co.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON, P. Thompson.

VIRGINIA.

RICHMOND, R. D. Sanxay.
NORFOLK, C. Hall.

KENTUCKY.

LEXINGTON, C. Wallan.

OHIO.

CINCINNATI, E. Deming.
MARIETTA, N. Ward.

NORTH CAROLINA.

RALEIGH, J. Gales & Son.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON, Thomas Cousins.
COLUMBIA, B. D. Plant.

GEORGIA.

AUGUSTA, W. J. Hobby.
SAVANNAH, Thomas Purse.

ALABAMA.

MOBILE, Odiorne & Smith.

TENNESSEE.

NASHVILLE, W. A. Eichbaum.
CHRISTIANVILLE, B. S. Parsons.

MISSISSIPPI.

NATCHEZ, F. Beaumont.

LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS, E. Johns & Co.

☞ The work will be sent by mail to any part of the United States on the remittance of one year's subscription (four dollars) to the Publisher, Boston, or to any of the agents, — subscribers paying postage, and taking the risk of conveyance.

The subscription becomes due on the publication of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May. Distant subscribers are expected to transmit the amount of their yearly subscriptions as soon as they receive the second number of each year.

